



1000000 17 12 9

Jim Lamoureux
Senior Attorney
Law and Government Affairs
Southern Region
jlamoureux@att.com

Promenade 1
1200 Peachtree Street N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30309
404 810 4196
FAX: 404 877 7648

January 26, 2000

Mr. David Waddell, Executive Secretary
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37245

Re: *Third Party Testing of BellSouth's Operational Support Systems;*
Docket No. 99-00347

Dear Mr. Waddell:

Enclosed please find the original and thirteen copies of the Florida Public Service Commission's Order Approving Master Test and Notice of Proposed Agency Action Order to Proceed with Third-Party Testing of Operational Support Systems, dated January 11, 2000. This information is provided in an attempt to keep the TRA abreast of activities pertaining to Third-Party Testing in other states in BellSouth's territory. Also enclosed is the Master Test Plan.

Copies of the enclosed are being provided to counsel of record for all parties. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jim Lamoureux".

Jim Lamoureux

Enclosures

FILE

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* 4/12
* Dkt Lib.
* CP/CM
file

In re: Consideration of
BellSouth Telecommunications,
Inc.'s entry into interLATA
services pursuant to Section 271
of the Federal
Telecommunications Act of 1996.

DOCKET NO. 960786-TL

ORDER NO. 127 11 10 9 (clipped page
only)

ISSUED:

In re: Petition of Competitive
Carriers for Commission action
to support local competition in
BellSouth Telecommunications,
Inc.'s service territory.

DOCKET NO. 981834-TP ←

ORDER NO. PSC-00-0104-PAA-TP

ISSUED: January 11, 2000

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition
of this matter:

JOE GARCIA, Chairman

J. TERRY DEASON

SUSAN F. CLARK

E. LEON JACOBS, JR.

ORDER APPROVING MASTER TEST PLAN
AND NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY
ACTION ORDER TO PROCEED WITH THIRD-PARTY TESTING
OF OPERATIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEMS

BY THE COMMISSION:

NOTICE is hereby given by the Florida Public Service
Commission that the action discussed herein regarding our decision
to proceed with Phase II of independent third-party testing of
operational support systems is preliminary in nature and will
become final unless a person whose interests are substantially
affected files a petition for a formal proceeding, pursuant to Rule
25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code.

I. Case Background

On December 10, 1998, the Florida Competitive Carriers
Association, Inc. (FCCA), the Telecommunications Resellers, Inc.
(TRA), AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. (AT&T),
MCImetro Access Transmission Services LLC (MCImetro), WorldCom
Technologies, Inc. (Worldcom), the Competitive Telecommunications
Association (Comptel), MGC Communications, Inc. (MGC), and

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

FILE

00438 JAN 11 8

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Intermedia Communications, Inc. (Intermedia) (collectively, "Competitive Carriers") filed their Petition of Competitive Carriers for Commission Action to Support Local Competition in BellSouth's Service Territory.

On December 30, 1998, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth) filed a Motion to Dismiss the Petition of the Competitive Carriers for Commission Action to Support Local Competition in BellSouth Service Territory. BellSouth requested that we dismiss the Competitive Carriers Petition with prejudice. On January 11, 1999, the Competitive Carriers filed their Response in Opposition to BellSouth's Motion to Dismiss.

At our March 30, 1999, Agenda Conference, we denied BellSouth's Motion to Dismiss. In addition, we denied the Competitive Carriers' request to initiate a rulemaking proceeding to establish expedited dispute resolution procedures for resolving interconnection agreement disputes. We also directed our staff to provide more specific information and rationale for its recommendation on the remainder of the Competitive Carrier's Petition.

On May 26, 1999, we issued Order No. PSC-99-1078-PCO-TP, wherein we granted in part and denied in part the petition of the Florida Competitive Carriers Association to support local competition in BellSouth's service territory. Specifically, we established a formal administrative hearing process to address UNE pricing, including UNE combinations and deaveraged pricing of unbundled loops. We also directed that workshops on OSS issues be conducted concomitantly, in an effort to resolve OSS operational issues. We indicated that the request for third-party testing of OSS systems was to be addressed in these workshops. These workshops were held on May 5-6, 1999. We also ordered a formal administrative hearing to address collocation and access to loop issues, as well as costing and pricing issues.

On May 28, 1999, the Florida Competitive Carriers Association (FCCA) and AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., (AT&T or FCCA/AT&T) filed a Motion for Independent Third Party Testing of BellSouth's Operational Support Systems. BellSouth filed its

Response to this Motion on June 16, 1999. That same day, FCCA and AT&T filed a Supplement to the Motion for Third Party Testing. On June 17, 1999, ACI Corp. (ACI) filed a Motion to Expand the Scope of Independent Third Party Testing. On June 28, 1999, BellSouth responded to the Supplement filed by FCCA and AT&T. On June 29, 1999, BellSouth responded to ACI's Motion to Expand the Scope of Independent Third Party Testing.

By Order No. PSC-99-1568-PAA-TP, issued August 8, 1999, we denied the motion. Upon our own motion, we implemented Phase I of our staff's proposal regarding third-party testing of BellSouth's OSS. Phase I of third-party testing required a third party, in this case KPMG, to develop a Master Test Plan (MTP) that would identify the specific testing activities necessary to demonstrate non-discriminatory access and parity of BellSouth's systems and processes.

Herein, we address the proposed final MTP for third-party testing of BellSouth's OSS in Florida. We also consider whether or not to proceed with Phase II of our staff's proposal to commence testing of BellSouth's OSS.

II. The Final MTP

Implementation of Phase I of our staff's testing plan required the development of a MTP that will be used to evaluate BellSouth's OSS interfaces and processes used to provide preordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing functions to ALECs. The purpose of the plan and the subsequent test is to provide sufficient information to allow us to fulfill our consultative role under Section 271 of the Telecommunication Act of 1996 (the Act) with regard to BellSouth's provision of OSS.

Our staff met with KPMG, BellSouth, and interested persons to discuss administrative and confidentiality concerns in proceeding with Phase I. A weekly conference call schedule was established in order to keep all parties aware of the MTP progress. Additionally, we established an OSS Testing website to communicate pertinent information to interested parties. The website includes information about the testing process, such as our staff's proposal

for third-party testing, meeting minutes, the draft MTP, and parties' comments concerning the draft MTP.

On September 29, 1999, KPMG published a draft MTP. A formal workshop was conducted by our staff and KPMG on October 15, 1999, for the purpose of receiving questions and comments on the draft MTP. All parties were in attendance. Thereafter, the parties filed formal comments on the draft test plan on October 29, 1999. Throughout the month of November, our staff worked with KPMG to ensure all appropriate concerns were incorporated into the MTP. A final MTP was published by KPMG on December 2, 1999.

The MTP scope includes a comprehensive evaluation of the OSS interfaces and processes that enable ALECs to compete with BellSouth for customers' local telephone service. The test plan is intended to provide adequate breadth and depth to evaluate the entire BellSouth/ALEC relationship under real world conditions. There are three main test areas: (1) Performance Metrics Review; (2) Policies and Procedures Review; and (3) Transaction Validation and Verification. The details of each of these test areas are discussed in the MTP, which is attached and incorporated herein as Attachment 1.

The test calls for the plan to be conducted using the latest BellSouth interfaces in production. The interfaces are expected to include: TAFI, ECTA, ODUF, ADUF, CRIS, CABS, LENS '99, TAG and EDI. Each of the service delivery methods, resale, UNE, and combinations of UNEs, including the UNE Platform, are included in the scope of the test. Test activities call for functional and performance evaluations of each of the core OSS processes of preordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing. The plan adopts a military-style test philosophy, which implies a "test until you pass" approach.

Under the MTP, the Phase II Test Manager will be required to build a Certified Software Interface (CSI) in order to submit transactions via BellSouth's interfaces and collect information regarding response times, intervals, and other compliance measures. The CSI is also required in order to document the ability of an ALEC to build, test, and place into operation the functionality

required to process transactions using BellSouth's documentation, account management, help desk function, and training support.

ALECs operating in Florida will also be asked to volunteer to participate in certain portions of transaction testing. In addition, the MTP calls for the Phase II Test Manager to host weekly meetings with the Commission, the ALECs, and BellSouth to keep all parties apprised of all relevant aspects of the project.

The test plan requires a thorough review of the performance metric systems and processes that BellSouth uses to report data to the ALECs. Performance metrics are the avenue by which the existence of nondiscrimination or parity will be established and monitored. An evaluation of performance metrics is included based on our decision in Order No. PSC-97-1459-FOF-TL, issued November 19, 1997, in Docket No. 960786-TL.

We note that the performance metrics that will be used for purposes of OSS testing are currently under review by an Interim Performance Metric Work Group, which is comprised of members of our staff, BellSouth staff, and members of the ALEC community. This work group will participate in two workshops and have two opportunities for comment regarding performance metrics. Currently, we are scheduled to address the final set of interim performance metrics for the purposes of OSS testing at our January 18, 2000, Agenda Conference. We anticipate that these interim performance metrics will serve as the starting point for developing permanent metrics once testing demonstrates whether the metrics are accurate and adequate.

Upon consideration of the foregoing and review of Attachment 1, which is attached and incorporated herein, we hereby approve the Master Test Plan for testing of BellSouth's OSS.

III. Implementation of Phase II - PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION

A. Phase II of OSS Testing

In order to meet the requirements of Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act), BellSouth is required to demonstrate to us that it has opened its local telecommunications markets to competition. A key element of this determination is BellSouth's provision of nondiscriminatory access to its OSS by ALECs for the resale of its retail telecommunications services and the provision of UNEs. Independent third-party testing will enable us to make a definitive determination of whether BellSouth has met this Section 271 criteria. Thus, if we determine that BellSouth's OSS pass third-party testing, BellSouth will be considered to have remedied the OSS concerns that we previously identified in Order No. PSC-97-1459-FOF-TL for purposes of our recommendation to the FCC on any future application by BellSouth for interLATA authority in Florida. Likewise, if only portions of BellSouth's OSS pass the third-party testing, BellSouth will not be required to make any further demonstration to us with regard to those portions, as we explained in Order No. PSC-99-1568-PAA-TP on Phase I of OSS testing.

Under Phase II of OSS testing, the Phase II Test Manager will be expected to evaluate the ability of an ALEC, with the documentation and support available from BellSouth, to develop OSS interface systems and software for each OSS function and to use such systems and software to provide telecommunications services. The Phase II Test Manager will be expected to perform the tests in full compliance with the MTP produced in Phase I, and herein approved.

At the end of the test, the Phase II Test Manager will be expected to provide a document that includes a report on the test results. This report shall provide the results of the test, pursuant to the MTP, and must provide details as to where BellSouth has met the requirements specified in the test plan. The report must also describe any differences between the access to OSS functions BellSouth provides itself and that which it provides to ALECs, analyze the operational effect of such differences, and make recommendations to rectify such differences.

The report must also discuss the Phase II Test Manager's assessment of the relative ease or complexity of creating the OSS

interfaces with the supplied documentation, and any additional support required of and provided by BellSouth to create the interfaces. The timeliness and level of support provided by after-market support services such as help desks and hot lines, and any additional areas of improvement that would materially reduce the cost, complexity, and time of systems and software development and operation to the CSI or to BellSouth must also be included. In addition, the report must include an analysis of the adequacy and appropriateness of the BellSouth performance metrics.

In view of the foregoing, we shall, therefore, begin Phase II of our staff's proposal for third-party OSS testing of BellSouth's operational support systems.

B. Phase II Test Manager

Upon consideration, we hereby select KPMG as the Phase II Test Manager for BellSouth's OSS testing based on the exceptional job done by KPMG on Phase I and their extensive experience in third-party testing of BellAtlantic in both New York and Pennsylvania, as well as experience in other states in the BellSouth region. We believe them to be well-qualified for this task. As such, we shall endeavor to establish a contract in this regard.

C. Proposed Cost Responsibility

In addition, we find that all costs for this testing shall be borne by BellSouth. The selected Phase II Test Manager shall, however, report directly to our Project Manager and shall have no reporting relationship with BellSouth.

BellSouth has not opposed this arrangement. Nevertheless, we note our belief that it is within our authority pursuant to Sections 364.01(3); 364.01(4)(d), (g), and (h); 364.183; 364.185; and 364.15, Florida Statutes, to require BellSouth to pay for this testing. When read together, these provisions indicate not only that it is within our jurisdiction to commence with Phase II of OSS testing, but that we may also require BellSouth to absorb the costs of the testing process.

ORDER NO. PSC-00-0104-PAA-TP
DOCKETS NOS. 960786-TL, 981834-TP
PAGE 8

Based on the foregoing, it is therefore

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the Master Test Plan for Operational Support Systems Testing, which is attached and incorporated in this Order as Attachment 1, is hereby approved. It is further

ORDERED that Phase II of the Proposal for Independent Third-Party Testing of BellSouth's Operations Support Systems, which was previously attached and incorporated in full in Order No. PSC-99-1568-PAA-TP, as consummated by Orders Nos. PSC-99-1712-CO-TL and PSC-99-1712A-CO-TL, shall be implemented as set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that the Test Manager is approved as set forth in the body of this Order and will report to our designated Commission Project Manager. It is further

ORDERED that the costs of this testing shall be borne by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that the actions ordered herein shall have equal force and affect for Dockets Nos. 981834-TP and 960786-TL. It is further

ORDERED that the provisions of this Order regarding our decision to proceed with Phase II of independent third-party testing of operational support systems, issued as proposed agency action, shall become final and effective upon the issuance of a Consummating Order unless an appropriate petition, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, is received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on the date set forth in the "Notice of Further Proceedings" attached hereto. It is further

ORDERED that in the event this Order becomes final, these Dockets shall remain open pending conclusion of Phase II and further proceedings as necessary.

ORDER NO. PSC-00-0104-PAA-TP
DOCKETS NOS. 960786-TL, 981834-TP
PAGE 9

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 11th
Day of January, 2000.

BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

By: Kay Flynn
Kay Flynn, Chief
Bureau of Records

(S E A L)

BK

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Mediation may be available on a case-by-case basis. If mediation is conducted, it does not affect a substantially interested person's right to a hearing.

Any party adversely affected by the portions of this order that are preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: (1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; (2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission;

ORDER NO. PSC-00-0104-PAA-TP
DOCKETS NOS. 960786-TL, 981834-TP
PAGE 10

or (3) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

The action proposed regarding our decision to proceed with Phase II of independent third-party testing of operational support systems is preliminary in nature. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on February 1, 2000.

In the absence of such a petition, the proposed agency action portion of this order shall become final and effective upon the issuance of a Consummating Order.

Any objection or protest filed in this docket before the issuance date of this order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

The State of Florida
Public Service Commission

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
OSS Evaluation Project
Master Test Plan

Final
Version 3.0



Copyrighted 1999

December 2, 1999

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| I. DOCUMENT CONTROL..... | 1 |
| A. DISTRIBUTION | 1 |
| B. APPROVED BY | 2 |
| II. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| A. BACKGROUND | 3 |
| B. SCOPE..... | 3 |
| C. OBJECTIVE..... | 5 |
| D. AUDIENCE..... | 5 |
| E. ASSUMPTIONS..... | 7 |
| F. LIMITATIONS..... | 8 |
| G. DOCUMENT STRUCTURE..... | 8 |
| III. TEST PLAN FRAMEWORK..... | 10 |
| A. TEST SCENARIOS | 10 |
| 1.0 Scenario Purpose..... | 11 |
| 2.0 Scenario Use..... | 11 |
| B. TEST DOMAINS | 12 |
| C. TEST FAMILIES | 13 |
| D. TEST PROCESSES | 14 |
| 1.0 Transaction-Driven System Analysis | 14 |
| 2.0 Operational Analysis | 16 |
| E. EVALUATION CRITERIA | 16 |
| F. TEST PROCESS ELEMENTS..... | 17 |
| 1.0 Entrance Criteria..... | 17 |
| 2.0 Exit Criteria..... | 19 |
| 3.0 Evaluation Techniques..... | 19 |
| IV. PERFORMANCE METRICS REVIEW TEST SECTION | 21 |
| A. PURPOSE..... | 21 |
| B. ORGANIZATION..... | 21 |
| C. SCOPE..... | 21 |
| D. TEST PROCESS..... | 21 |
| 1.0 Test PMR1: Data Collection and Storage Verification and Validation Review | 23 |
| 2.0 Test PMR2: Metrics Definition and Standards Development and Documentation Verification and Validation Review..... | 25 |
| 3.0 Test PMR3: Metrics Definition and Standards Change Management Verification and Validation Review..... | 26 |
| 4.0 Test PMR4: Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review | 28 |
| 5.0 Test PMR5: Metrics Calculations Verification and Validation Review..... | 30 |
| V. PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES REVIEW TEST SECTION | 32 |
| A. PURPOSE..... | 32 |
| B. ORGANIZATION..... | 32 |
| C. SCOPE..... | 32 |
| D. TEST PROCESS..... | 33 |
| 1.0 Test PPR1: Change Management Practices Verification and Validation Review..... | 34 |
| 2.0 Test PPR2: Account Establishment & Management Verification and Validation Review..... | 36 |
| 3.0 Test PPR3: OSS Interface Help Desk Functional Review | 38 |
| 4.0 Test PPR4: CLEC Training Verification and Validation Review..... | 40 |
| 5.0 Test PPR5: OSS Interface Development Verification and Validation Review..... | 42 |
| 6.0 Test PPR6: Collocation and Network Design Verification and Validation Review | 44 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 7.0 Test PPR7: POP Manual Order Processing Evaluation | 47 |
| 8.0 Test PPR8: POP Work Center Support Evaluation | 49 |
| 9.0 Test PPR9: Provisioning Process Evaluation | 51 |
| 10.0 Test PPR10: Billing Work Center/Help Desk Support Evaluation | 56 |
| 11.0 Test PPR11: Daily Usage Feed Returns – Process Evaluation | 60 |
| 12.0 Test PPR12: Daily Usage Production and Distribution - Process Evaluation | 62 |
| 13.0 Test PPR13: Bill Production and Distribution - Process Evaluation | 63 |
| 14.0 Test PPR14: End-to-End M&R Process Evaluation | 65 |
| 15.0 Test PPR15: M&R Work Center Support Evaluation | 67 |
| 16.0 Test PPR16: Network Surveillance Support Evaluation | 70 |
| VI. TRANSACTION VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION TEST SECTION | 73 |
| A. PURPOSE | 73 |
| B. ORGANIZATION | 73 |
| C. SCOPE | 73 |
| D. TEST PROCESSES | 73 |
| 1.0 Test TVV1: POP Functional Evaluation | 75 |
| 2.0 Test TVV2: POP Volume Performance Tests | 83 |
| 3.0 Test TVV3: Order “Flow Through” Evaluation | 86 |
| 4.0 Test TVV4: Provisioning Verification and Validation | 89 |
| 5.0 Test TVV5: M&R TAFI Functional Evaluation | 91 |
| 6.0 Test TVV6: M&R ECTA Functional Evaluation | 94 |
| 7.0 Test TVV7: M&R TAFI Performance Evaluation | 98 |
| 8.0 Test TVV8: M&R ECTA Performance Evaluation | 100 |
| 9.0 Test TVV9: End-to-End Trouble Report Processing | 102 |
| 10.0 Test TVV10: Billing Functional Usage Evaluation | 104 |
| 11.0 Test TVV11: Functional Carrier Bill Evaluation | 107 |
| APPENDIX A: TEST SCENARIOS | 112 |
| APPENDIX B. NORMAL AND PEAK VOLUME TEST SECTION | 117 |
| A. PURPOSE | 117 |
| B. SCOPE | 117 |
| C. DATA DEVELOPMENT | 117 |
| APPENDIX C: STATISTICAL APPROACH | 118 |
| A. OVERVIEW | 118 |
| B. MEASURES | 118 |
| C. SAMPLING | 118 |
| D. HYPOTHESIS TESTING | 118 |
| E. PARITY TESTS AND NON-PARITY TESTS | 118 |
| F. RESULTS | 119 |
| APPENDIX D: METRICS - QUANTITATIVE | 120 |
| APPENDIX E: REFERENCE DOCUMENTS | 121 |
| APPENDIX F: GLOSSARY | 124 |

I. Document Control

A. Distribution

Table I-1: Distribution List For Document

| Contact | Organization | Date Sent |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Sharon Norris | AT&T | |
| Marsha Rule | AT&T | |
| Cheryl Bursh | AT&T | |
| Rhonda Merritt | AT&T | |
| Jay Bradbury | AT&T | |
| Rick Melson | ACI-Rhythms | |
| Jeremy Marcus | ACI-Rhythms | |
| Kristin Smith | ACI-Rhythms | |
| Kathy Wilson-Chu | BellSouth | |
| Milton McElroy | BellSouth | |
| William Stacy | BellSouth | |
| Marshall Criser | BellSouth | |
| Nancy Sims | BellSouth | |
| Andrea Kearney | FCC | |
| Vicki Kaufman | FCCA | |
| Michael Gross | FCTA | |
| Martha Johnson | FCTA | |
| Lisa Harvey | FPSC | |
| Carl Vinson | FPSC | |
| Paul Stallcup | FPSC | |
| Lynn Fisher | FPSC | |
| Walter D'Haeseleer | FPSC | |
| Beth Keating | FPSC | |
| Demetria Watts | FPSC | |
| Sally Simmons | FPSC | |
| Calvin Favors | FPSC | |
| Lans Chase | Intermedia | |
| Charlie Pellegrini | Intermedia | |
| Brian Musselwhite | ITC-Deltacom | |
| John McLaughlin | KMC | |
| Raymond Sears | KPMG | |
| Michael Weeks | KPMG | |
| Michael Adderly | KPMG | |
| Mia Okumura | KPMG | |
| Wilson Hendricks | KPMG | |
| William Pitcher | KPMG | |
| Sherry Lichtenberg | MCI WorldCom | |
| Georgia Hyland | MCI WorldCom | |
| Mark Turner | MCI WorldCom | |
| John Sivori | MCI WorldCom | |
| Carol Zimmerman | MCI WorldCom | |
| Kevin Hartrich | MCI WorldCom | |

| Contact | Organization | Date Sent |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Evelyn Ruffin | MCI WorldCom | |
| Dulaney O'Roark | MCI WorldCom | |
| Donna McNulty | MCI WorldCom | |
| Debbie Carter | MGC | |
| Marilyn Ash | MGC | |
| Earl Poucher | Office of Public Counsel | |
| Mark Smith | Sprint | |
| Charles Rehwinkel | Sprint | |
| Jim Lenihan | Sprint | |
| Wayne Stavanja | Supra Telecom | |
| Karen Camechis | Time Warner | |
| Brent Marshall | US Department of Justice | |
| Anu Seam | US Department of Justice | |
| Frances Marshall | US Department of Justice | |

B. Approved By

Table I-2: Approval List For Document

| Person | Department | Date |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| Lisa Harvey | Florida Public Service Commssion | |

Table I-3: Version Control

| Version | Date | Reason |
|---------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.0 | September 30, 1999 | Initial Draft Release |
| 1.1 | November 12, 1999 | Draft Release |
| 2.1 | November 24, 1999 | Final Draft Release |
| 3.0 | December 2, 1999 | Final Copy Release |

II. Introduction

A. Background

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act) requires BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BST) in Florida to:

- Provide just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory access to its operations support systems (OSS);
- Provide the documentation and support necessary for competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) to access and use these systems; and
- Demonstrate that BST's systems are operationally ready and meet prescribed performance standards.

Compliance with these requirements will allow competitors to obtain pre-ordering information, submit service orders for resold services and unbundled network elements (UNEs), submit trouble reports, and obtain billing information at a level deemed to be non-discriminatory when compared with BST's retail operations.

BST's offers various systems, including both application-to-application interfaces and terminal-type/Web-based systems, which CLECs can use to access BST's OSS in order to perform these tasks. The Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) has retained KPMG LLP (KPMG) to design a Master Test Plan which will assist it with assessing whether BST is meeting these requirements.

B. Scope

This document describes the plan to evaluate BST's OSS systems, interfaces, and processes that enable CLECs to compete with BST's for customers' local telephone service. In determining the breadth and depth of the test, all stages of the CLEC-ILEC relationship were considered. These include the following:

- Establishing the relationship
- Performing daily operations
- Maintaining the relationship

Further, each of the service delivery methods — resale, unbundled network elements (UNE) and combinations of UNEs, including the UNE Platform (UNE-P) — were included in the scope of the test.

The plan has been divided into three test families to organize and facilitate testing:

- Performance Metrics Review (PMR)

- Policies and Procedures Review (PPR)
- Transaction Validation and Verification (TVV)

Within each of the test families, the methods and processes to be applied to measure BST's performance are described along with the specific points in the systems and processes where BST performance will be evaluated. The results of the test will be compared against measures and criteria identified by the FPSC and other measures and criteria as deemed appropriate by the FPSC.

This plan also describes the development and application of scenarios to be used within the TVV test families in evaluating BST's OSS and related support services. KPMG developed these scenarios to test the functionality of BST's pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning (POP); maintenance and repair (M&R); and billing systems. The scenarios were designed to depict real-world situations that CLECs currently face or may face in the near future. The scenarios will be used to develop test cases that provide a detailed description of the transactions and introduce additional variables such as errors and supplements to further simulate real world transactions. The test will be conducted using the latest BST interfaces in production. The interfaces are expected to include TAFI, ECTA, ODUF, ADUF, CRIS, CABS, LENS99, TAG, and EDI. TAG consists of two interfaces; RoboTag – the current name for the GUI TAG interface, and TAG – the machine-to-machine interface. Additionally, the test will be conducted using the most current release of the BellSouth business rules at the time of the test. The Phase II Test Manager is expected to test BellSouth's OSS '99, scheduled for release in December 1999.

Military Style Test

This plan will adopt the military-style test philosophy, which suggests a "test until you pass" approach. This is believed to be in the best interest of all parties seeking an open, competitive market for local services in Florida.

The process works as follows:

- If a problem is encountered during the test, the Phase II Test Manager will inform the FPSC and BST by creating written Observations or Exceptions describing the problem and providing an assessment.
- An Observation will be created if the Phase II Test Manager determines that a test reveals one of BST's practices, policies, or system characteristics might result in a negative finding in the final report.
- An Exception will be created if the Phase II Test Manager determines that a test reveals one of BST's practices, policies, or system characteristics is not expected to satisfy one or more of the evaluation criteria defined for the test.

- Observation and Exception status will be discussed weekly by the FPSC, the Phase II Test Manager, and BST. CLECs will be able to listen to the calls as observers, as well as ask clarifying questions.
- CLECs will be able to view Exceptions on the FPSC web site as well as provide input on them to the FPSC.
- Observations may or may not become Exceptions. Some Exceptions will not have been identified as Observations.
- BST will respond to Observations verbally and to Exceptions in writing. These responses will describe either a clarification of the issue or BST's intended fix(es) to the problem. The responses will be posted on the FPSC website.
- The Phase II Test Manager will be responsible for determining if an Exception is resolved. If in responding to an Exception BST has made a change to a process, system, or document, the Phase II Test Manager will retest as appropriate.
- If an Exception is not resolved, the cycle will continue to iterate until closure is reached, no further action is warranted, or the FPSC specifically exempts the Exception from further testing.

Because of the potential extended time involved in these activities, it may not always be possible or practical to retest all activities within the scope of this test. At the conclusion of this test, there may be some Exceptions that remain open. The FPSC will decide and advise all parties on how to proceed with such Exceptions.

C. Objective

This overall objective of this document is to provide a description of a comprehensive plan to test BellSouth's OSS systems, interfaces, and processes. This Master Test Plan shall be the basis by which individual tests can be developed and executed. The test results will help the FPSC to determine whether BST's provision of access to OSS functionality enables and supports CLEC entry in the local market. To meet these objectives, KPMG developed a test plan that is intended to provide adequate breadth and depth to evaluate the entire CLEC/ILEC relationship under real world conditions.

D. Audience

The audience for this document falls into two main categories:

1. Readers using this document during the testing process
2. Interested parties who have some stake in the result of the BST OSS evaluation and wish to have insight into the evaluation effort

The primary user of this document is the Phase II Test Manager. Others are the FPSC, BST, the CLECs, the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Test Manager

The Phase II Test Manager has overall responsibility for the management of the testing process described in this document. This document will be used by the Phase II Test Manager to guide the various parties involved in this testing effort.

Certified Software Interface (CSI)

The CSI is the entity responsible for the array of technologies which enable transactions to be submitted to and received by BST. These technologies will be developed and maintained by the Phase II Test Manager. Others, working under the direction of the Phase II Test Manager, may provide additional technology.

Florida Public Service Commission

The Florida Public Service Commission is responsible for providing input on additional tests, measures, or criteria that should be considered. The Phase II Test Manager will provide results and preliminary evaluation of the results to the FPSC. The FPSC is responsible for the final evaluation of the test results.

BellSouth Florida

BST will use this document to understand the testing framework in order to prepare its test bed. This document describes the requirements BST must satisfy to prepare for and execute the tests.

The CLEC Community

The CLECs will use this document to understand the breadth and depth of the test. In addition, this document describes the elements required of the CLECs to prepare for their role in the tests. The terms ALECs and CLECs are synonymous, and the term CLECs will be used throughout this document.

Department of Justice

The Department of Justice may observe the process of developing, conducting, and evaluating the tests.

The Federal Communications Commission

The Federal Communications Commission may observe the process of developing, conducting, and evaluating the tests.

E. Assumptions

This section describes the assumptions made in the development of this Test Plan.

- BST will provide suitable resources in sufficient numbers to assist the Phase II Test Manager and the Certified Software Interface with the evaluation effort.
- BST will provide access to appropriate documentation.
- BST will provide the necessary resources, facilities, and support for the Certified Software Interface to establish connectivity with its systems and to create the test bed required to execute the tests (e.g., office space; equipment; IDs; security access; customer accounts and addresses; and appropriate company codes).
- BST will process test transactions as part of normal processing including the provisioning of some scenarios/test cases.
- BST and, where appropriate, CLECs will provide the facilities required to execute the live scenarios.
- BST and, where appropriate, CLECs will allow the Phase II Test Manager to observe retail and wholesale processes on-site during the evaluation effort.
- BST and the CLECs will give the Phase II Test Manager access to historical data and current operational reports, as needed, to complete the evaluation.
- BST will allow the Phase II Test Manager to inspect algorithms that may have a bearing on parity access, such as the algorithm used to manage trouble reports.
- BST will maintain a stable environment for the duration of the evaluation.
- The Certified Software Interface will maintain a results database.
- The Certified Software Interface will evaluate the documentation, integration support, and interfaces that BST provides CLECs trying to develop and access its OSS.
- Regulatory, legal, and confidentiality issues or concerns can be resolved without significant impact to either the intent of the tests, the ability to execute the tests, or the schedules for their execution.

F. Limitations

The purpose of this section is to describe some limitations of the testing effort. These limitations will be described in terms of what is to be tested and what conclusions can be drawn from the results.

- In some cases, certain order types, troubles, and processes may not be practically tested by the Certified Software Interface. Examples include orders with very long interval periods (such as the establishment of collocation arrangements) or high volumes of test provisioning transactions. Accordingly, the test may take the form of an interview, inspection, live orders review, review of historical performance or operational reports, or some other method that will capture the performance of BST with respect to the order types and processes in question. The Test Family Test Plans will identify the tests that can be executed live and those that must be executed by other means. Long interval tests that prove to have no alternative test methods that foreshorten the test will be referred, with a recommendation for disposition, to the FPSC. The FPSC will make the final decision regarding the disposition of such tests.
- Operational, time and resource constraints make it impossible to construct a completely, exhaustive test suite. Significant effort has been expended to clearly portray the scope of the proposed suite, and it is believed this suite does provide both extensive and sufficient coverage. Provision has been made in the plan to amend or extend the test coverage if, in the judgment of the FPSC, an amendment or extension is deemed justified.
- It is not practical or desirable to execute certain live tests that would disrupt service to BST or CLEC customers. An example would be a Maintenance and Repair test that requires an equipment failure. BST performance for these test cases will be evaluated by other means. The Test Family Evaluation Plans will identify the tests that can be executed live and those that must be executed by other means.

G. Document Structure

This section describes the structure of the document. It includes a table that lists each major section number along with a brief description.

Table II-1 Document Overview

| Sect. No. | Section | Content |
|-----------|------------------|---|
| I | Document Control | Identifies document distribution and necessary approvals. |

| Sect. No. | Section | Content |
|------------|--|---|
| II | Introduction to the Document | Documents project background, scope, and objectives, assumptions, and limitations. Includes who should read the document, and how it is structured. |
| III | Test Plan Framework | Describes the methodologies for testing BellSouth's systems, interfaces and processes. Includes how testing is segmented and organized, testing components, entrance and exit criteria, data acquisition, and traceability. |
| IV | Performance Metrics Review Test Section | Describes the methods and procedures for evaluating BST's data collection, transfer, and processing into its performance metrics. |
| V | Policies and Procedures Review Test Section | Describes the methods and procedures for evaluating the BST Wholesale's business rules. |
| VI | Transaction Verification and Validation Test Section | Describes the methods and procedures for verifying and validating BST's core systems through a series of transaction tests. |
| Appendix A | Test Scenarios | Describes the scenarios to be used in this test. |
| Appendix B | Normal and Peak Volumes Test Section | Describes the volumes to be used in testing. |
| Appendix C | Statistical Approach | Describes the statistical methods and tests used to determine whether parity exists. |
| Appendix D | Metrics Criteria | Lists metrics for process areas gathered from sources such as the Interim Guidelines. |
| Appendix E | References / Documents | References used in developing this document. |
| Appendix F | Glossary | Testing terms and definitions used in this document. |

III. Test Plan Framework

The overall test of BST's OSS is designed to be multi-faceted and provide end-to-end coverage of the systems, interfaces, and processes that fall within the scope of the testing effort. In constructing a master test plan, many factors were considered, including the systems and processes to be tested, the measurement points and respective evaluation criteria, and the necessary conditions required to stage a successful, efficient, and objective test. The Phase II Test Manager is expected to execute all tests listed in this plan.

In order to develop a comprehensive, complete, and thorough test of BST's OSS systems, interfaces, and processes, the master test plan framework was defined along five key dimensions:

- Test Scenarios
- Test Families
- Test Domains
- Test Processes
- Evaluation Criteria

The test scenarios and the test domains define **what is to be tested**. *Test scenarios* provide the contextual basis for testing by defining the transactions, products, volumes, data elements, and other variables that must be considered and included during testing. The *test families* organize the systems and processes to be tested. The *test domains* define the systems and processes to be tested.

Test processes and evaluation criteria define **how testing will be conducted**. *Test processes* define the techniques, measures, inputs, activities, and outputs of each component test. *Evaluation criteria* serve as the basis for evaluation by defining the norms against which test results are compared.

These concepts are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

A. Test Scenarios

Based on KPMG's industry experience, the knowledge gained from the New York Public Service Commission Test, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Test, and the Georgia third party test, as well as a review of the available offerings in Florida, KPMG has developed a representative set of test scenarios.

The test scenarios describe at a high level realistic situations in which CLECs purchase wholesale services and network elements from BST to be resold or repackaged to the CLEC's end-user customer on a retail basis. The key principles applied in generating

the scenarios included: (1) emulating real world coverage, mix, and types of transactions while (2) balancing the requirement for practical and reasonably executable transactions which would not unduly disrupt normal production or negatively affect customer service. In general, each test scenario describes a real-world situation that will be used to create test cases.

1.0 Scenario Purpose

Scenarios serve several key purposes. Scenarios help define the products, services, and transactions that should be included for testing. In this regard, test scenarios provide the guidance and framework for developing "real world" test cases to simulate live production in a controlled test environment. The test cases provide the actual detailed instructions required to build individual transaction test instances.

These scenarios will be used to test functionality, performance; and other attributes associated with the ability of CLECs to access information from BST business processes and associated systems. Scenarios provide a way to bridge across test domains and families, thereby facilitating both point-specific and end-to-end testing of various systems and processes and providing the breadth and depth of coverage of products and services to be tested.

2.0 Scenario Use

A list of the scenarios is provided in table form in Appendix A. In general, they specify a high-level description of a transaction situation. For example, one scenario is to change features for an existing CLEC Resale business POTS customer. These scenarios are used to generate specific test cases.

The test cases represent variations on the basic scenario. For example, from the scenario mentioned above, there could be several test cases. One such test case might be to delete Call Waiting and add Caller ID to each line of a ten-line business customer with sequential hunting among the lines. Another case might be to add hunting to a five-line business customer account and then cancel the order after two days. Yet another case might be to remove hunting from a seven-line business customer and then supplement the order three days later to remove Call Waiting from the auxiliary lines. A further case might be to introduce a specific intentional error in this order and then supplement to correct the error.

Each of these test cases would drive the definition of detailed test instances for various components of the total test. These test instances would correspond to the test case for a specific customer account. The Phase II Test Manager is expected to transmit numerous test instances for each of more than 500 test cases. KPMG requests that the Phase II Test Manager solicit input from CLECs operating in Florida to supply test scenarios. Only the high-level scenarios, and not the more detailed test cases or instances are listed in this document to assure that the test will be as blind as possible.

Detailed test instances will be generated from these test cases. Test instances represent a set of transactions described by a test case for a specific customer account. For example, a test case might specify "migrate a two-line business customer from BST to a CLEC and add call waiting on the primary line." A test instance would perform the necessary pre-ordering inquiries and send an order to accomplish this activity for a specific two-line business customer account.

For functionality testing, volumes of test instances will be assigned to each of the test cases based, in part, on a determination of the sufficiency of sample sizes to determine compliance with appropriate Performance Metrics (or Service Quality Measurements). (The method for determining the appropriate Performance Metrics that will be used in this test is described elsewhere in this Test Plan.) However, for practical reasons it is expected that transactions of greater complexity will tend to be executed in smaller volumes. Other considerations that will be taken into account by the Phase II Test Manager in determining test volumes will be assurance of sufficient samples by customer type (residence vs. business), as well as by service delivery method. In addition, the Phase II Test Manager may determine based on experience in other jurisdictions and further analysis of CLEC experience in Florida to add additional volumes to certain scenarios.

For volume testing, normal expected volumes will then be assigned to a selected set of the test cases based on expected real world production in the July 2001 timeframe. Individual test instances that match the test cases will be generated based on the volume that has been assigned.

In addition, a stress volume test will be conducted to test the capacity and identify potential choke points of the interfaces. Stress volumes will be assigned to a subset of the test case types based on some multiplier of the normal expected volumes.

B. Test Domains

The areas subject to testing exist in four domains that mirror the major business functions performed by a telecommunications carrier:

- Pre-Order, Order, and Provisioning (POP)
- Maintenance and Repair (M&R)
- Billing (BLG)
- Relationship Management and Infrastructure (RMI)

These four domains correspond to the four respective business functions that comprise the BST/CLEC relationship. The domains are useful in defining the areas to be tested and the specific tests to be conducted.

Pre-Order, Order, and Provisioning Domain

This domain is comprised of the systems, processes, and other operational elements associated with BST's support for Pre-Ordering, Ordering, and Provisioning activities for wholesale services and unbundled network elements. The purpose of the specified tests is to evaluate functionality, to evaluate compliance with prescribed measurements, and to provide a basis for comparing this operational area to parallel systems and processes supporting BST's Retail Operations.

Maintenance and Repair Domain

This domain is comprised of the systems, processes, and other operational elements associated with BellSouth's support for Wholesale Maintenance and Repair activities. Tests associated with this domain provide a basis for comparing this operational area to parallel systems and processes supporting BST's Retail Operations and Industry Standards.

Billing Domain

This domain is comprised of the systems, processes and other operational elements associated with BST's support for Wholesale Billing. Tests associated with this domain are designed to evaluate BST's compliance to measurement agreements and to ensure adherence to sound management practices.

Relationship Management & Infrastructure Domain

This domain is comprised of the systems, processes and other operational elements associated with BST's establishment and maintenance of business relationships with the CLECs.

C. Test Families

The areas subject to testing have been organized into three test families that are composed of tests that require similar methods of evaluation. The three test families are:

- Transaction Verification and Validation
- Processes and Procedures Review
- Performance Metrics Review

These three test families are useful in organizing the areas to be tested and the specific tests to be conducted. The Transaction Verification and Validation (TVV) test family will be comprised of transaction-based tests, while the Processes and Procedures Review (PPR) test family will review BST's wholesale business rules and management practices. The third test family, Performance Metrics Review (PMR), will review BST's service quality measurement data collection, calculation, and reporting functions.

Within each of these test families, specific test targets have been identified for testing. The POP, Billing, and M&R domains will be addressed in each of the test families. RM&I will be addressed completely within the PPR test family. The relationship between the test families and test domains is shown below.

Figure III-5: Domain/Test Family Matrix

| | POP | Billing | M&R | RM&I |
|-----|-----|---------|-----|------|
| PMR | X | X | X | |
| PPR | X | X | X | X |
| TVV | X | X | X | |

D. Test Processes

Within each of the three test families, specific test processes to be executed have been defined.

In general, two kinds of tests have been developed:

- Transaction-Driven System Analysis
- Operational Analysis

1.0 Transaction-Driven System Analysis

Tests utilizing transaction-driven system analysis rely on initiation of transactions, tracking of transaction progress, and analysis of transaction completion results to evaluate a system under test. Transaction-driven system analysis requires defining several key facets of testing, including the data sources (e.g., CLEC live data, BST historical data), the system components under test (e.g., application-to-application interfaces, graphical user interfaces), and volumes (e.g., normal, stress).

The transactions, or test instances, to be used in each transaction-driven system analysis test will be derived from higher level sets of one or more transactions called test cases, which in turn have been developed from test scenarios. See the Scenario section above for additional discussion. Many transaction-driven tests utilize a Certified Software Interface (CSI) to facilitate testing.

Certified Software Interface (CSI)

The CSI provides the capability to generate the full suite of real world test cases by submitting transactions via BST's electronic interfaces and collecting information about the response times, intervals, and other compliance measures.

The CSI will generate and submit the required number of transactions to test the expected normal and stress volumes, ensure the processing of the full breadth of transactions during the test period, and repeat test cases in the required volumes in a controlled test environment. A work center will be assembled to provide for interactive

processing, such as handling errors, exceptions, and resubmittals. This work center will also submit manual transactions to BST and await responses.

Further, the CSI will be required to document its ability to build, test, and place in operation the functionality required to successfully process transactions utilizing BST's documentation, account management, help desk, and training support.

CLEC Involvement in Transaction Testing

CLECs operating in Florida will be asked to volunteer to participate in certain portions of this test. The inclusion of selected CLEC live transactions provides an alternative test method for transactions which may not be practical to provide through the test CSI and further facilitates a more realistic depiction of real world production. CLEC participation will also be solicited to provide real test cases during the test period.

Use of CLEC live transactions allows for an element of blind testing and tracking performance in a "real-world" environment. It also provides a means to help control for "test bias." Use of these transactions will require extensive participation by the Phase II Test Manager either to observe the execution of the transactions in order to measure, audit, inspect and monitor progress and report results or otherwise verify and validate the observed results.

Additionally, some of the transaction types submitted by the CSI can only be properly executed with direct involvement from the CLECs. One category of such tests are those that include complex transactions involving physical CLEC facilities. For example, UNE orders involving LNP require a physical switch and a real CLEC in order to be fully completed. Another category would be those tests requiring realistic customer data, such as address validation and directory listing inquiries.

Further, there are scenarios where in-progress live transactions cannot be obtained or are not practical to execute in a test environment. These will be evaluated utilizing historical information, if such data is provided by the CLECs and/or BST. Historical transactions will be applied in those cases where the process has been stable for a sufficient length of time and where data can be validated by the Phase II Test Manager.

The successful execution of those portions of the test requiring CLEC participation is dependent on the extent of that participation. The Phase II Test Manager will meet those CLECs who volunteer to participate to mutually agree on the nature and extent of the participation.

Additionally, the Phase II Test Manager will host weekly meetings with the FPSC, the CLECs, and BST to address and keep them apprised of all relevant aspects of the project.

2.0 Operational Analysis

Tests utilizing operational analysis focus on the form, structure, and content of the business process under study. This test method will be used to evaluate day-to-day operations and operational management practices, including policy development, procedural development, and procedural change management. Operational analysis validates and verifies the results of a process to determine that the process functioned correctly and according to documentation and expectations. Operational analysis also tests compliance by reviewing management practices and operating procedures against legal, statutory, and other requirements.

E. Evaluation Criteria

Measures and their corresponding evaluation criteria provide the basis for conducting tests. Evaluation criteria are the norms, benchmarks, standards, and guidelines used to evaluate measures identified for testing. Evaluation criteria provide a framework for the scope of tests, the types of measures that must be taken during testing, and the approach necessary for analyzing results.

There are four types of evaluation criteria:

Table III-1: Evaluation Criteria

| Evaluation Criteria Type | Description | Examples |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Quantitative | These criteria set a threshold for performance where a numerical range of values is possible, such as response time. | System response time is four seconds or less. |
| Qualitative | These criteria set a threshold for performance where a range of quality values is possible, such as level of customer satisfaction. | Documentation defining daily usage feeds is adequate. |
| Parity | These are criteria that require two measurements to be developed and compared, such as whether external response time is at least as good as internal response time. | CLEC transaction time no greater than BST Retail transaction time. |
| Existence | These are criteria where only two possible test results can exist (e.g., true/false, presence/absence), such as whether a document exists or not. | Documentation defining daily usage feeds exists. |

The evaluation criteria to be applied in the overall test effort are based largely on the legal and regulatory requirements for functionality and performance applicable to BST's OSS. Overall, evaluation criteria are derived from three types of sources, as shown below.

Table III-2: Sources of Evaluation Criteria

| Evaluation Criteria Source Types | Description |
|---|---|
| Legal and Regulatory Requirements | Requirements specified by statute and regulation, such as FCC orders, court orders, FPSC regulations, federal and state statutes, and other binding requirements resulting from judicial or governmental proceedings. |
| Consensus Requirements | Norms, benchmarks and standards developed by formal consensus proceedings. |
| Good Management Practices (GMP) | Widely recognized standards and guidelines promulgated by sanctioned industry and governmental organizations and other bodies (e.g., Telecommunications and Industry Forum); also includes benchmarks, performance goals, and guidelines derived from industry and topic area experts, BST and CLEC performance targets, publications, academic journals and other sources. |

F. Test Process Elements

For every test defined within each test family, the test process includes a description of the test, its objectives, the targets and scope of the test, the measures to be used, the test scenarios which apply to the test, the test's inputs, activities, and outputs, as well as entrance and exit criteria. Several key test process elements are described in the following sections. Each test process specifies the evaluation techniques used to capture and analyze information developed during testing and the evaluation measures used to conduct testing.

1.0 Entrance Criteria

Entrance criteria are those requirements that must be met before individual tests can commence. Global entrance criteria, which apply to every individual test (except where noted otherwise), include the following:

1. The Test Plan has been approved.

The Test Plan must be approved by the FPSC.

2. All legal dependencies have been resolved.

Any pending legal and regulatory proceedings that impact the ability to perform the test must be concluded in a manner, which allow testing to proceed. Any necessary legal or regulatory approvals must be secured.

3. The FPSC has verified measurements to be used in the test.

The Performance Metrics to be used in the test must be determined by the FPSC and fully defined. In addition they must be fully functional, tested, and operationally ready. Fully functional BST measurements are required to support collection of test results and to ensure a method exists to monitor on-going compliance. With assistance from the Phase II Test

Manager, the FPSC will assess the operational readiness of all required BST measurements and verify that all requirements have been met.

4. All required BST interface capabilities must be operationally ready.

Electronic interfaces to all OSS access functions of Pre-Ordering, Ordering, Provisioning, Maintenance and Repair, and Billing must be fully tested and operational. All GUI interface capabilities to be tested must be operational.

5. For transaction tests to begin, the Certified Software Interface must be operationally ready.

The CSI is to be developed by the Phase II Test Manager based on specifications and documentation provided by BST. The successful operation of the CSI will demonstrate the feasibility of developing, testing, and operating the CLEC side of the OSS interface based upon documentation supplied by BST.

6. The Phase II Test Manager will review relevant source documentation from the other states in the BellSouth region.

The Phase II Test Manager will review OSS testing in other states in the BellSouth region to determine whether the results of those tests may be duplicative of any specific portion of this Master Test Plan. The Phase II Test Manager may rely on the results of those tests rather than conducting duplicative testing, where the Phase II Test Manager can attest that the testing done in the other states is independent and reliable and can be used as a basis for evaluation acceptable to the Florida Public Service Commission. To be considered duplicative, a test must meet the specifications listed in the Florida MTP.

Table III-3 Global Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|-----------------------------|
| The Test Plan has been approved. | FPSC |
| All legal dependencies have been resolved. | BST, FPSC |
| Resolutions to legal dependencies approved. | FPSC |
| The FPSC has completed the definition of interim metrics to be used in Florida for the purpose of this test based on input from the Work Groups and the FPSC has verified all other relevant measurements to be used in the test. | FPSC |
| All required BST interface capabilities must be operationally ready. | BST |
| The Certified Software Interface must be operationally ready. | CSI, Phase II Test Manager |
| Phase II Test Manager has reviewed relevant source documentation from the other states in the BellSouth | Phase II Test Manager, FPSC |

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|----------|-------------------|
| Region. | |

2.0 Exit Criteria

Exit criteria are the requirements that must be met before the tests defined in the Test Plan can be concluded.

1. All test activities required by the MTP must be completed.

For each test, all fact finding and analysis activities must be completed. All results and test methodologies have been documented. Any exceptions must be resolved or retesting completed, unless specifically exempted by the FPSC.

2. All change control, verification, and confirmation steps have been completed.

The results of test activities must be documented and reviewed for accuracy. Any results that require clarification or follow-up are confirmed.

In addition to these global exit criteria, test-specific exit criteria, where applicable, are defined within each test.

Table III-4 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|-----------------------|
| All required test activities must be completed. | Phase II Test Manager |
| All change control, verification, and confirmation steps have been completed. | Phase II Test Manager |

3.0 Evaluation Techniques

Each test relies on one or more techniques to collect and record measurements and analyze the results. The five types of techniques defined for this test are described in the chart below.

Table III-5: Evaluation Techniques

| Technique | Description |
|------------------------|---|
| Transaction Generation | Transaction generation is the use of live, historical, and/or generated data which is executed through the system under review. The results of this test are evaluated for quality. |
| Report Review | Review and analysis of historical data, reports, metrics, and other information in order to assess the effectiveness of a particular system or business function. This includes performance measurement reports and other management reports. |
| Inspection | Physical review of process activities and products, including site visits, walk-throughs, read-throughs, and work center observations. |

| Technique | Description |
|-----------------|--|
| Logging | Monitoring activities and collecting information by logging process events and products as they happen. Logging can be mechanized or manual. |
| Document Review | Compilation and review of books, manuals, and other publications related to the process and system under study. |

IV. Performance Metrics Review Test Section

A. Purpose

The purpose of this section is to define the specific tests to be undertaken in evaluating the systems, processes, and other operational elements associated with BST's support for Performance Metrics (Service Quality Measurements).

B. Organization

The Performance Metrics Review is organized into three test target areas, which represent the key focus areas for testing in this domain. The Performance Metrics scope section contains a series of tables that identify the specific tests to be associated with each target test area. The tables are organized based upon subject test matter.

The subsequent section, Performance Metrics Review "Test Process," provides additional information and tables that further define the testing approach, inputs, outputs, as well as entrance and exit criteria.

C. Scope

The Performance Metrics Review test family is comprised of three test target areas, representing important and generally distinct areas of effort undertaken by BST. The three test target areas are:

- Standards & Definitions
- Data Processing
- Data Retention

Each target test area is further broken down into a number of increasingly discrete Process and Sub Process Areas that serve to identify the particular area of interest under test.

D. Test Process

Five tests have been designed to address the three test target areas. The organization of the subject test processes is as follows:

- PMR1: Data Collection and Storage Verification and Validation Review
- PMR2: Metrics Definitions and Standards Development and Documentation Verification and Validation Review
- PMR3: Metrics Definitions and Standards Change Management Verification and Validation Review

PMR4: Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review

PMR5: Metrics Calculations Verification and Validation Review

The three test target areas and five metrics tests will review all of the service quality measures that BST is currently reporting, in part based on requirements of state and federal regulators. The metrics to be used in the test will be determined by the FPSC before the test commences. This determination will be based on input from a Work Group consisting of representatives from CLECs active in Florida, BST, and the FPSC Staff. When these metrics have been determined, they will be listed in Appendix D.

The metrics tests will involve an examination of both live industry data and, where applicable, data from the test transactions performed by the Phase II Test Manager. The tests will involve an investigation of the processes both for developing the metrics and for deriving the standards derived from retail analogs. That is, both CLEC and Retail data will be included in the test. In addition, the FPSC Staff Proposal indicated that the test should "[analyze] the adequacy and appropriateness of the measures provided in BST's SQM." To address this need, the Phase II Test Manager will make an assessment, based on its professional judgement, of whether there are any major gaps in the coverage of, or in design problems with the BST metrics. This judgement could be based in part on the results of the Processes and Procedures Reviews and the Transactions Verification and Validation tests described elsewhere in this test plan.

1.0 Test PMR1: Data Collection and Storage Verification and Validation Review

1.1 Description

This test evaluates key policies and practices for collecting and storing raw and target data necessary for the creation of performance metrics. The procedures both for data used in the calculation of the metrics and data required for the calculation of retail analogs will be included. This test will rely on checklists and inspections.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to determine the adequacy and completeness of key policies and procedures for collecting and storing performance data.

1.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

1.4 Test Scope

Table IV-1 Test Target: Data Collection and Storage Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------------|---|---|--|---------------|
| Collection of Data | Collection policies & procedures for CLEC and retail data | Adequacy and completeness of collection policies and procedures | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Identification of collection points | Applicability of and measurability from control points | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Existence of collection tools | Adequacy and scalability of data collection tools | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Internal Controls | Adequacy and completeness of the internal control process | Inspection Document review Report Review | Qualitative |
| Storage of Data | Storage policies & procedures for CLEC and retail data | Adequacy and completeness of storage policies and procedures | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Identification of storage sites | Applicability of and measurability from control points | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Existence of storage tools | Adequacy and scalability of data storage tools | Inspection | Qualitative |

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------|------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| | Internal Controls | Adequacy and completeness of the internal control process | Inspection Document review Report Review | Qualitative |

1.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

1.6 Test Approach

1.6.1 Inputs

1. BST Metrics Policies and Processes documentation
2. PMAP Documentation
3. Other procedural and technical documentation
4. Evaluation checklists
5. Interview guides

1.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Review collection and storage policies and procedures for both CLEC data and data used in calculations of retail analogs
3. Perform walkthrough of BST facilities that are relevant to the production of performance measurements
4. Perform interviews and documentation reviews
5. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
6. Develop and document findings.

1.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

1.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

2.0 Test PMR2: Metrics Definition and Standards Development and Documentation Verification and Validation Review

2.1 Description

This test evaluates the overall policies and practices for developing and documenting metrics definitions and standards. This would include policies and practices associated with both CLEC and, for standards that are retail analogs, retail measurements. This test will rely on checklists, document reviews and inspections.

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to determine the adequacy and completeness of key procedures for developing, documenting, and publicizing standards and definitions for performance metrics.

2.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

2.4 Test Scope

Table IV-2 Test Target: Metrics Definition and Standards Development and, Documentation Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|---------------|
| Metrics Definitions | Documentation of Metrics Definitions | Adequacy and completeness of Metrics Definitions | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Distribution of Metrics Definitions | Adequacy and completeness of the distribution of the Metrics Definitions | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| Standards Definitions | Documentation of Standards Definitions | Adequacy completeness of Standards Definitions | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Distribution of Standards Definitions | Adequacy and completeness of the distribution of the Standards Definitions | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |

2.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

2.6 Test Approach

2.6.1 Inputs

1. BST Metrics Development Documentation
2. PMAP Documentation
3. Other procedural and technical documentation that may be appropriate
4. Evaluation checklists
5. Interview guides

2.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Perform interviews and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Analyze the adequacy and appropriateness of the measures provided in BST's SQM.
5. Develop and document findings

2.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

2.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

3.0 Test PMR3: Metrics Definition and Standards Change Management Verification and Validation Review

3.1 Description

This test evaluates the overall policies and practices for managing the change of the standards and definitions in the BST metrics and the calculation of the metrics, and the communication of these changes to the FPSC and the CLECs. This would include policies and practices associated with both CLEC and, where the standards are retail analogs, retail measurements. This test will rely on checklists, document reviews and inspections.

3.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to determine the adequacy and completeness of key procedures for developing, conducting, monitoring, and publicizing change management of the performance metrics.

3.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

3.4 Test Scope

Table IV-3 Test Target: Metrics Definition and Standards Change Management Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| Change Management | Developing Change Proposals | Completeness and consistency of change development process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Evaluating Change Proposals | Completeness and consistency of change evaluation process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Implementing Change | Completeness and consistency of change implementation process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Intervals | Reasonableness of change interval | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Documentation | Timeliness of documentation updates | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Tracking Change Proposals | Adequacy and completeness of change management tracking process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |

3.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

3.6 Test Approach

3.6.1 Inputs

1. BST Metrics Development Documentation

2. PMAP Documentation
3. Other procedural and technical documentation that may be appropriate
4. Evaluation checklists
5. Interview guides

3.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Perform interviews and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Develop and document findings

3.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

3.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

4.0 Test PMR4: Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review

4.1 Description

This test evaluates the overall policies and practices for processing the data used by BST in the production of the reported performance metrics and standards. This test will rely on document reviews, inspections, and sampling of partially-converted data. Both CLEC and retail data will be included in the test. In addition, both retrospective data and data derived from the transactions submitted by the Phase II Test Manager will be included.

4.2 Objectives

The objective of this test is to determine the integrity of key procedures for processing the data necessary for the production of performance metrics.

4.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

4.4 Test Scope

Table IV-4 Test Target: Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|----------------|---|---|--|---------------|
| Data Integrity | Transfer of data from point(s) of collection | Adequacy and completeness of the data transfer process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Conversion of data from raw to processed form | Adequacy and completeness of the conversion policies and procedures | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Internal Controls | Adequacy completeness of the internal control process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |

4.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

4.6 Test Approach

4.6.1 Inputs

1. BST Metrics Change Management Policies and Procedures PMAP Documentation
2. PMAP Documentation
3. Other procedural and technical documentation that may be appropriate
4. Evaluation checklists
5. Interview guides

4.6.2 Activities

1. Gather documentation.
2. Perform interviews and documentation reviews.
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries.
4. Gather sample of data.
5. Analyze data
6. Develop and document findings.

4.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

4.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

5.0 Test PMR5: Metrics Calculations Verification and Validation Review

5.1 Description

This test evaluates the processes used to calculate performance metrics and retail analogs. The test will rely on re-calculating metrics and retail analogs and reconciling any discrepancies to verify and validate the reporting of the metrics. The test will use both retrospective data and data collected by the Phase II Test Manager and BST from the execution of transactions. This test will also analyze the documentation published by BellSouth about metrics and the consistency between the documentation and the procedures used for calculating metrics. The test will rely on checklists, document reviews, inspections, and standard statistical techniques.

5.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to determine the accuracy of recent metrics calculations and to verify that the metrics as produced by BST are consistent with its documentation and stated objectives.

5.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Successful Completion of PMR 3 | Phase II Test Manager |

5.4 Test Scope

Table IV-5 Test Target: Metrics Calculations Review Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------|
| Metrics Calculations | Accuracy of metrics calculations | Ability to recreate calculations of metrics values and retail analogs | Calculation | Quantitative |
| | Documentation | Consistency between documentation and metrics programs | Document review | Qualitative |

5.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

5.6 Test Approach

5.6.1 Inputs

1. BST definitions and standards as verified by PMR2
2. BST's target database as verified and validated by PMR1
3. PMAP Documentation
4. Other procedural and technical documentation that may be appropriate
5. Evaluation checklists
6. Interview guides

5.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Perform interviews and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Gather data from
5. Recreate performance metrics from target data
6. Develop and document findings

5.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Completed performance metrics calculations
3. Summary report

5.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

V. Processes and Procedures Review Test Section

A. Purpose

The purpose of this section is to define the specific tests to be undertaken in evaluating the systems, processes and other operational elements associated with BST's establishment and maintenance of business relationships with the CLECs. Areas to be evaluated include the provisioning of on-going operational support to CLECs in a manner both adequate to CLEC business needs and comparable to that provided to BST retail operations.

B. Organization

The Processes and Procedures Review "Scope" section contains a series of tables that identify the types of tests to be associated with each Target Test Area and are organized based upon test subject matter.

The subsequent section, Processes and Procedures Review "Test Process," provides additional information and tables that further define the testing approach, inputs, outputs, as well as entrance and exit criteria. The tests are grouped to enable an efficient overall test procedure.

C. Scope

The Process and Procedures Review Test family is comprised of Target Test Areas representing important and generally distinct areas of effort undertaken by BST to establish and subsequently support CLECs. These Target Test Areas include:

- Change Management
- CLEC Training
- Account Establishment & Management
- Forecasting
- Interface Development
- Network Design, Collocation and Interconnection Planning
- Domain Specific Process Reviews

Each Target Test Area is further broken down into a number of increasingly discrete Process and Sub Process Areas that serve to identify the particular area of interest under test.

D. Test Process

Sixteen test processes have been designed to address the seven Test Target areas. The organization of the subject test processes is as follows:

- PPR1 Change Management Practices Verification and Validation Review
- PPR2 Account Establishment & Management Verification and Validation Review
- PPR3 OSS Interface Help Desk Functional Review
- PPR4 CLEC Training Verification and Validation Review
- PPR5 OSS Interface Development Verification and Validation Review
- PPR6 Collocation and Network Design Verification and Validation Review
- PPR7 POP Manual Order Processing Evaluation
- PPR8 POP Work Center/Help Desk Support
- PPR9 Provisioning Process Evaluation
- PPR10 Billing Work Center/Help Desk Support Evaluation
- PPR11 Daily Usage Feed Returns – Process Evaluation
- PPR12 Daily Usage Production and Distribution – Process Evaluation
- PPR13 Billing Production and Distribution – Process Evaluation
- PPR14 End-to-End M&R Process Evaluation
- PPR15 M&R Work Center Support Evaluation
- PPR16 Network Surveillance Support Evaluation

1.0 Test PPR1: Change Management Practices Verification and Validation Review

1.1 Description

This test evaluates BST's policies and procedures for managing changes to the OSS interfaces and business processes utilized by CLECs. The change management practices for BST-initiated and CLEC-initiated changes shall be considered. Additionally, data will be reviewed to evaluate change management of a major software release from initiation through implementation. BellSouth's OSS '99, scheduled for release in December 1999 is the anticipated major software release to be tested by the Phase II Test Manager.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to determine the adequacy and completeness of procedures for developing, publicizing, conducting, and monitoring change management.

1.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

1.4 Test Scope

Table V-1 Test Target: Change Management Practices Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| Change Management | Developing Change Proposals | Completeness and consistency of change development process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Evaluating Change Proposals | Completeness and consistency of change evaluation process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Implementing Change | Completeness and consistency of change implementation process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Intervals | Reasonableness of change interval | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Documentation | Timeliness of documentation and notification updates | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------|---------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| | Tracking Change Proposals | Adequacy and completeness of change management tracking process | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |

1.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

1.6 Test Approach

1.6.1 Inputs

1. BST change management process documentation
2. Other procedural and technical documentation
3. BST instructions to CLECs for interacting with change management functions and interpreting change management activities
4. Evaluation checklists
5. Interview guides
6. CLEC data and interviews
7. Change management process artifacts, such as change management meeting notes, change management notifications and updated specifications

1.6.2 Activities

1. Gather documentation and other relevant data
2. Perform interviews and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Develop and document findings

1.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

1.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

2.0 Test PPR2: Account Establishment & Management Verification and Validation Review

2.1 Description

This test evaluates BST-FL's policies and practices for establishing and managing CLEC account relationships. Account establishment and management activities such as requests for account manager assistance are included in the scope of this test.

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to determine the adequacy, completeness, and compliance with procedures for developing, publicizing, conducting, and monitoring account management. Additionally, account establishment and management practices will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

2.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |
| Interval standards for account management responsiveness to CLEC requests | FPSC |

2.4 Test Scope

Table V-2 Test Target: Account Establishment & Management Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Establishing an Account Relationship | Staffing | Appropriateness of roles and responsibilities | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Capacity, coverage, and account allocation | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |
| Maintaining an Account Relationship | Customer contact | Adequacy and completeness of procedures for responding to customer requests | Interviews Logging Report Review | Qualitative Parity |

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute Intervals | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | Responsiveness to customer contacts relative to established interval standards | Inspection Document review | Quantitative |
| | Escalation | Adequacy, completeness and effectiveness of escalation procedures | Inspection Document review Interviews | Qualitative Parity |
| | Routine and urgent customer communications | Adequacy and completeness of communication and notification procedures | Inspection Document review Interviews | Qualitative Parity |
| | Customer documentation | Adequacy and completeness of procedures for developing, distributing, and maintaining customer documentation | Inspection Document review Interviews | Qualitative Parity |
| Account Management Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

2.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

2.6 Test Approach

2.6.1 Inputs

1. BST account management procedural documentation
2. BST instructions to CLECs for interacting with account managers
3. Other procedural, technical, and customer documentation
4. Evaluation checklists
5. Interview guides
6. CLEC data (such as documented, independently verifiable account management contacts)
7. Retail analogs (as applicable)

2.6.2 Activities

1. Gather documentation and other relevant data
2. Perform BST and CLEC interviews and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Develop and document findings

2.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

2.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

3.0 Test PPR3: OSS Interface Help Desk Functional Review

3.1 Description

This test is an evaluation of the BST's help desk functions, which provide technical and system administration support for its OSS interfaces.

3.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to:

- Determine adequacy, completeness and consistency of help desk processes
- Ensure help desk functions have effective management oversight
- Determine whether help desk escalation procedures are correctly maintained, documented and published
- Determine the existence and functionality of procedures for measuring, tracking, projecting and maintaining help desk performance
- Ensure existence of reasonable security measures to ensure integrity of help desk data and the ability to restrict access to parties with specific access permissions

3.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

3.4 Test Scope

Table V-3 Test Target: OSS Interface Help Desk Functional Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Process Help Desk Call | Resolution of user question, problem or issue | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| Close Help Desk Call | Closure posting | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| Status Tracking and Reporting | Status tracking and reporting | Completeness and consistency of reporting process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| Problem Escalation | User and BST initiated escalation | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| Capacity Management | Capacity planning process | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| Security and Integrity | Data access controls | Security of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| Process Management | General management practices | Completeness and consistency of operating management practices | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| | Performance measurement process | Controllability, efficiency and reliability of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |
| | Process improvement | Completeness of process improvement practices | Inspection Document review | Qualitative |

3.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

3.6 Test Approach

3.6.1 Inputs

1. Procedural documentation (such as internal help desk procedure manuals)

2. BST instructions to CLECs for interacting with help desk functions
3. Evaluation checklists
4. Interview guides

3.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Perform walk-through and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists
4. Develop and document findings

3.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists
2. Summary report

3.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

4.0 Test PPR4: CLEC Training Verification and Validation Review

4.1 Description

This test evaluates key aspects of BST's training program for CLECs. Additionally, the CLEC training program will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

4.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to:

- Determine the existence and functionality of procedures for developing, publicizing, conducting, and monitoring CLEC training
- Ensure the CLEC training effort has effective management oversight

4.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist and interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |

4.4 Test Scope

Table V-4 Test Target: CLEC Training Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Training Program Development | Develop curriculum | Completeness of training curriculum and forums | Document review Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Adequacy of procedures to respond to information about training quality and utilization | Document review Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Adequacy of procedures to accept CLEC input regarding training curriculum | Document review Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| | Publicize training opportunities | Availability of information about training opportunities | Document review Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| Training Program Quality Assurance | Attendance/ utilization tracking | Adequacy of process to track utilization and attendance of various training tools and forums | Document review Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| | Session effectiveness tracking | Adequacy of process to survey training recipients on effectiveness of training | Document review Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| | Instructor oversight | Adequacy of procedures to monitor instructor performance | Document review Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| Process Management | Performance measurement process | Controllability, efficiency and reliability of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |
| | Process improvement | Completeness of process improvement practices | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |

4.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

4.6 Test Approach

4.6.1 Inputs

1. Procedural documentation (such as training manuals)

2. BST instructions to CLECs for accessing BST training
3. Evaluation checklists
4. Interview guides
5. Retail analogs (as applicable)

4.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Perform interviews and documentation review
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Develop and document findings

4.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

4.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

5.0 Test PPR5: OSS Interface Development Verification and Validation Review

5.1 Description

This test evaluates BST's methods and procedures for developing, providing, and maintaining OSS interfaces for pre-ordering, ordering, and maintenance & repair. The interfaces that are relevant to this test include BST's TAG, EDI, LENS99, TAFI, and ECTA products.

5.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to determine the adequacy, consistency and completeness of BST's methods and procedures for developing, providing and maintaining OSS interfaces. The test shall also evaluate the capacity management practices used by BST for its OSS interfaces and gateway systems.

5.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

5.4 Test Scope

Table V-5 Test Target: OSS Interface Development Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|
| Developing Interfaces | Interface development methodology | Adequacy and completeness of interface development methodology | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Provision of interface specifications and related documentation | Adequacy and completeness of interface documentation distribution procedures | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| Enabling and Testing Interfaces | Interface enabling and testing methodology | Adequacy and completeness of carrier-to-carrier interface enabling and testing procedures | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Availability of test environments and technical support to CLECs | Availability and adequacy of - functioning test environments, testing protocols, production cutover protocols and technical support for all supported interfaces | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| | Interface enabling and testing support | Adequacy and completeness of interface enabling and testing procedural documentation | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| Maintaining Interfaces | Release management | Adequacy and completeness of interface enhancement and software release management protocols | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |
| OSS Interface Capacity Management | Capacity management | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management practices for OSS interfaces and gateway systems | Inspection Document review Report review | Qualitative |

5.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

5.6 Test Approach

5.6.1 Inputs

1. Procedural and technical documentation
2. BST instructions to CLECs for enabling, testing, and maintaining compatibility with interfaces
3. Evaluation checklists
4. Interview guides
5. CLEC data and interviews

5.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Perform BST and CLEC interviews and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Develop and document findings

5.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

5.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

6.0 Test PPR6: Collocation and Network Design Verification and Validation Review

6.1 Description

This test evaluates BST's policies and practices for collocation and network design related to establishing and maintaining CLEC ability to access unbundled network elements. This test also evaluates BST's trunk forecasting process. (This test is not intended to examine interconnection for other purposes, such as an interexchange carrier's network-to-network level interconnection.)

6.2 Objectives

The objectives of this test are to:

- Determine whether CLECs have sufficient information and BST technical support to adequately prepare for and implement network designs and collocations
- Determine whether collocation and network design processes are well structured and managed to produce intended results
- Determine the existence and functionality of procedures for developing, publicizing, conducting, and monitoring trunk forecasting efforts with CLECs
- Verify integration of trunk forecasting procedures with BST facilities planning procedures
- Ensure the trunk forecasting effort has effective management oversight

6.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria requirements | See Table III-3 |
| Process evaluation checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview guides | Phase II Test Manager |

6.4 Test Scope

Table V-6 Test Target: Collocation and Network Design Verification and Validation Review

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| Network design and collocation | Planning | Adequacy and completeness network design and collocation planning processes | Document review Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Project management | Adequacy and completeness of collocation project management procedures | Document review Report review Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Resources | Availability and adequacy of resources and qualified technical support to facilitate collocation activities | Document review Report review Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Testing and implementation | Adequacy and completeness of network design and collocation testing processes | Document review Report review Inspection | Qualitative |

| Process Area | Sub Process/ Attribute | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| Trunk Forecasting | Forecast Development | Adequacy and completeness of trunk forecasting procedures | Document review Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Forecast Security | Adequacy and completeness of procedures for ensuring confidentiality of CLEC-provided forecast information | Document review Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Forecast usage | Availability and integration of published trunk forecasts in BST facilities planning process | Document review Inspection | Qualitative |
| Collocation Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

6.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

6.6 Test Approach

6.6.1 Inputs

1. Procedural and technical documentation
2. BST instructions to CLECs for planning and implementing network designs and collocations
3. Evaluation checklists
4. Interview guides
5. CLEC data

6.6.2 Activities

1. Gather information
2. Perform BST and CLEC interviews and documentation reviews
3. Complete evaluation checklists and interview summaries
4. Develop and document findings

6.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

6.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Limited to Global Exit Criteria requirements | See Table III-4 |

7.0 Test PPR7: POP Manual Order Processing Evaluation

7.1 Description

The POP Manual Order Processing Evaluation is a comprehensive review of the methods and procedures used to handle orders that have been manually submitted or require manual intervention by BST during order processing. Operational analysis techniques will be used to conduct this test. It will rely on the development of various checklists to facilitate a structured walk through of the order handling process. Additionally, practices related to the manual processing of orders will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

7.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to validate the processes and procedures used to support manual submission of orders for service.

7.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| All global entrance criteria | See Table III-3 |
| Manual Orders Procedures | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Process review checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview list | BST, Phase II Test Manager |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |

7.4 Test Scope

The table below outlines the processes and subprocesses involved in evaluating the timeliness, consistency, and accuracy of manual processing of orders.

Table V-7 Test Target: Manual Order Processes

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Receive Orders for Manual Processing | Order Receipt and Logging | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Process Orders Manually | Entry of Order into SOCS | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| Send Order Response | Delivery of error messages and queries | Completeness and consistency of reporting process | Inspection Document Review | Qualitative Parity |
| | Delivery of confirmations and completions | Completeness and consistency of reporting process | Inspection Document Review | Qualitative Parity |
| Status Tracking and Reporting | Status tracking and reporting | Completeness and consistency of reporting process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |
| Problem Escalation | User-initiated escalation | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |
| Process Management | General management practices | Adequacy and completeness of processing management practices | Inspection Document review | Qualitative Parity |
| | Performance measurement process | Adequacy and completeness of manual order processing performance management practices | Inspection | Qualitative Parity |

7.5 Scenarios

Not Applicable

7.6 Test Approach

7.6.1 Inputs

1. Order handling methods and procedures
2. Interview checklist
3. Process review checklist
4. Personnel to conduct interviews
5. Retail analogs (as applicable)

7.6.2 Activities

1. Review procedure documents.
2. Interview BST personnel.
 - Monitor/walk through process.
 - Observe management oversight system
3. Complete process review checklist.
4. Create evaluation summary.

7.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed process review checklists
2. Completed interview checklists
3. Evaluation summary

7.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria | See Table III-4 |

8.0 Test PPR8: POP Work Center Support Evaluation

8.1 Description

The POP Work Center Support Evaluation is a comprehensive operational analysis of the work center/help desk processes developed by BST to support Resellers and CLECs with OSS questions, escalations, problems, and issues related to pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning. Basic functionality, performance and escalation procedures will be evaluated.

8.2 Objectives

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

- Determine completeness and consistency of work center/help desk processes and responses
- Determine whether the escalation procedure is documented and known to work center agents and management
- Determine the accuracy and completeness of procedures for measuring work center/help desk performance

8.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| All global entrance criteria | See Table III-3 |

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|-----------------------|
| Work Center/Help Desk Evaluation Checklist completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| CLEC Problem Feedback Survey completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| POP Problem Response Survey with standard questions completed | Phase II Test Manager |

8.4 Test Scope

The table below outlines the processes and sub-processes involved in evaluating the timeliness, consistency, and accuracy of handling work center and help desk activities related to pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning performed by BST.

Table V-8 Test Target: POP Work Center/Help Desk Support

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Respond to Help Desk Call | Answer call | Completeness and consistency of process | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Interface with user | Availability of user interface | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Log call | Completeness of logged information Log is kept in appropriate media for appropriate interval | Document Review Inspection | Qualitative |
| Process Help Desk Call | Access to systems to observe user problems | Ability to access user records and transactions | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Resolve user question, problem or issue | Completeness and consistency of process | Documentation Review | Qualitative |
| Close Help Desk Call | Log closure information | Completeness, consistency, and timeliness of process | Inspection | Qualitative |
| Monitor Status | Track status | Accuracy and completeness of status tracking capability Availability of jeopardy notification | Inspection Document Review | Qualitative |
| | Report status | Completeness and consistency of reporting process Accessibility of status report | Inspection Document Review | Qualitative |
| Request Escalation | Manage escalations | Consistency and completeness of procedure | Document Review Inspection | Qualitative |
| Manage the Help Desk Process | Provide management oversight | Completeness and consistency of operating management practices | Inspection | Qualitative |

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

8.5 Scenarios

Not applicable

8.6 Test Approach

8.6.1 Inputs

1. Work Center/Help Desk Evaluation Checklist
2. Help Desk procedural documentation

8.6.2 Activities

1. Conduct work center/help desk evaluation using the Work Center/Help Desk Support Checklist.

8.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed Work Center/Help Desk Evaluation Checklist
2. Summary Report

8.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria | See Table III-4 |

9.0 Test PPR9: Provisioning Process Evaluation

9.1 Description

The Provisioning Process Evaluation is a parity and evaluative review of the processes, systems, and interfaces that provide provisioning for CLEC and Reseller orders. The test will also review the procedures, processes, and operational environment used to support coordinated provisioning with CLECs. The review will focus on these areas:

- Order interfaces
- Workflow definitions
- Workforce scheduling
- Memory administration

- Service activation
- Test and acceptance
- Exception handling
- Completion notices
- Coordinated provisioning

The focus of the evaluation will be "downstream" interfaces from manual processing and the gateway system that serves as the interface to all order processing.

As appropriate, provisioning processes for different products and services will be evaluated separately. This will be required in those cases where the process and/or systems used for provisioning are different by product.

The evaluation will address products and situations that require coordinated provisioning to minimize customer disruption. The requirement for coordination may come from either BST policy or a CLEC request.

BST has indicated that the provisioning systems for Wholesale and Retail are the same, with both using SOCS and the same downstream provisioning and maintenance systems. The Phase II Test Manager will verify that the same processes and systems are used to provision orders. An operational analysis test approach will be used to evaluate BST's coordinated provisioning processes. It will consist of targeted interviews of key development personnel along with structured reviews of process documentation facilitated by an evaluation checklist. Case studies of actual coordination processes will be created or selected from live CLEC situations. Case studies will be selected and tracked to determine process operation.

9.2 Objective

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

- Determine completeness and consistency of provisioning processes and to verify that the processes and systems utilized to provision retail and wholesale orders are in parity
- Determine whether the provisioning processes are correctly documented, maintained, and published
- Determine the accuracy, completeness, and functionality of procedures for measuring, tracking, projecting, and maintaining provisioning processes performance
- Ensure the provisioning coordination processes have effective management oversight

- Ensure responsibilities for provisioning coordination processes performance improvement are defined and assigned

9.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| All global entrance criteria | See Table III-3 |
| Detailed Provisioning Process Parity Evaluation Checklist developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Required system documentation available | BST |
| Provisioning process documentation available | BST |
| Technical platforms specifications available | BST |
| Databases specifications available | BST |
| Data communications and interfaces specifications available | BST |
| Interview guide/questionnaire developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| CLEC Case Study Request completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| CLEC Case Study Monitoring Form completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Detailed Provisioning Coordination Process Checklist developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interviewees identified and schedule developed | BST, Phase II Test Manager |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |

9.4 Test Scope

The table below outlines the processes and sub-processes involved in evaluating BST provisioning systems and processes to the CLECs and resellers.

Table V-9 Test Target: Provisioning Process

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-----------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---------------|
| Provisioning Process Parity | Order entry process (BST internal) | Consistency and repeatability as compared to Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Workflow management | Consistency and repeatability as compared to Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Workforce management | Consistency and repeatability as compared to Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Service activation process | Consistency and repeatability as compared to Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Service design process | Consistency and repeatability as compared to Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Assignment process | Consistency and repeatability as compared to Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Service activation/installation intervals | Consistency with Retail | Inspection | Parity |

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| Support Provisioning Coordination Process | Provision orders requiring coordination with CLECs | Availability of personnel, procedures and methods | Document Review | Existence |
| | | Completeness and consistency of processes | Document Review, Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Request coordination | Completeness and consistency of processes | Document Review, Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Notification of provisioning schedule | Completeness and consistency of processes | Document Review, Inspection | Qualitative |
| | | Timeliness of notification | Document Review, Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Coordinate provisioning | Completeness and consistency of operating management practice | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | | Controllability, efficiency and reliability of process | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | | Completeness of process improvement practices | Inspection | Qualitative |
| Provisioning Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

9.5 Scenarios

Not Applicable

9.6 Test Approach

9.6.1 Inputs

1. Product and Service process flow for understanding of complex versus simple services
2. Applicable BST provisioning process documentation
3. Interview guides/questionnaires
4. Interviewees (per process area)
 - Provisioning process owners
 - Provisioning process staff
 - User requirements project leader
5. Interview schedule
6. Provisioning process parity evaluation checklists
7. Appropriate system documentation

8. Appropriate methods and procedures (determined via interviews)
9. CLEC case studies
10. Coordinated provisioning process evaluation checklists
11. Retail analogs (as applicable)

9.6.2 Activities

1. Identify all process documentation needed for review
2. Identify relevant systems and interfaces
3. Identify all system documentation available for review
4. Compare and contrast systems used for Wholesale and Retail
5. Send case study requests to CLECs
6. Receive and compile CLEC case study input suggestions
7. Conduct structured reviews of documentation
8. Conduct interviews
9. Select and record case studies to monitor
10. Monitor case studies and record results
11. Inspect physical systems and communications environments
12. Review case studies
13. Document findings

9.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists
2. CLEC case study submission and selection matrix
3. A Summary report highlighting the differences and contrasting the systems used for Wholesale and Retail.
4. Conclusion

9.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria | See Table III-4 |

10.0 Test PPR10: Billing Work Center/Help Desk Support Evaluation**10.1 Description:**

The Billing Work Center/Help Desk Support Evaluation is an operational analysis of the work center/help desk processes and documentation developed by BellSouth (BST) to provide support to Resellers and CLECs with usage (Daily Usage Feed) and/or billing related claims, questions, problems and issues. Basic functionality, performance, escalation procedures, and security will be evaluated. Additionally, the billing work center will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

10.2 Objectives:

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

- Determine completeness and consistency of work center/help desk processes, documentation and responses.
- Determine whether the escalation procedure is correctly documented, maintained, published and followed.
- Determine the accuracy, completeness, and functionality of procedures for measuring and tracking work center/help desk performance. Determine the accuracy, completeness, and functionality of procedures for projecting resource needs and maintaining work center/help desk performance.
- Ensure accuracy and completeness of reasonable security measures to ensure integrity of work center/help desk data and the ability to restrict access to parties with specific access permissions.
- Ensure the work center/help desk effort has effective management oversight.
- Ensure responsibilities for performance improvement are defined and assigned.

10.3 Entrance Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| All Global Entrance Criteria satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| BST Billing Process and System specialists available for observation and interviews | BST |
| Work Center/Help Desk documentation identified and available | Phase II Test Manager |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |

10.4 Test Scope:

The scope of this test includes all processes, sub-processes, and measurements of the Billing Work Center test target, as shown in Table V-12 below.

Table V-10 Test Target: Billing Work Center/Help Desk Support

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Receive Help Desk Call | Answer call | Timeliness of call | Inspections | Quantitative Parity |
| | Interface with user | Usability of user interface | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Availability of user interface | Inspections | Quantitative Parity |
| | Log call | Existence of call logging | Document Review | Quantitative Parity |
| | | Accuracy of call logging | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Record severity code | Compliance of call logging - severity coding | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Process Help Desk Call | Resolve user question, problem or issue | Completeness and consistency of process | Documentation Review, inspections | Quantitative Parity |
| | | Accuracy of response | Inspections | Quantitative Parity |
| Receive Claim | File claim | Completeness and consistency of process | Documentation Review, inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Accuracy of response | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Process claim | Completeness, consistency, and timeliness of process | Inspections, report review | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Issue adjustment when necessary | Documentation review, inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| | Disposition claim | Accuracy, completeness and reliability of disposition report | Inspections, report review | Quantitative Parity |
| Close Help Desk Call | Post closure information | Completeness, consistency, and timeliness of process | Inspections | Quantitative Parity |
| | | Accuracy of posting | Inspections, report review | Quantitative Parity |

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|
| Monitor Status | Track Status | Existence of status tracking capability | Inspections | Existence Parity |
| | | Consistency and frequency of follow-up activities | Document Review | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Availability of jeopardy notification | Document Review | Quantitative Parity |
| | Report Status | Completeness and consistency of reporting process | Inspections, report review | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Accuracy and timeliness of report | Inspections, report review | Quantitative Parity |
| | | Accessibility of status report | Inspections | Quantitative Parity |
| Request Escalation | Identify escalation procedure | Existence of procedure | Document Review | Existence Parity |
| | Evaluate escalation procedure | Completeness of the procedure | Document Review | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Consistency of the process | Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |
| Provide Security and Integrity | Provide secured access | Completeness and applicability of security procedures, profiles, and restrictions | Document Review, Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Controllability of intra-company access | Document Review, Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Manage the Help Desk Process | Provide management oversight | Completeness and consistency of operating management practices | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Controllability, efficiency and reliability of process | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | | Completeness of process improvement practices | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |

10.5 Scenarios:

Not applicable.

10.6 Test Approach:

This test utilizes operational analysis to evaluate BST Billing Work Center Support/Help Desk Support processes and related documentation. It will rely on the development of various evaluation checklists to facilitate a structured walk-through of the major Work Center/Help Desk processes with BST representatives and to review process documentation.

This test will initiate calls to the Work Center/Help Desk. These calls will be generated based on data (DUF and Bills) received during the Usage and Billing transactions test. Results will be evaluated based on BST's timeliness and consistency of response to the calls.

10.6.1 Inputs

1. Detailed operational test plan
2. BST Work Center/Help Desk specialists.
3. Process documentation
4. Arrangements for placing of test calls
5. Retail analogs (as applicable)

10.6.2 Activities

1. Develop Work Center/Help Desk process evaluation checklist
2. Develop Work Center/Help Desk call questions, logging forms and expected answers
3. Conduct Work Center/Help Desk process walk-through and interviews
4. Place and log Help Desk test calls
5. Compile findings

10.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed Work Center/Help Desk Evaluation
2. Completed final report for the Work Center/Help Desk Evaluation

10.7 Exit Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| All Global Exit Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |

11.0 Test PPR11: Daily Usage Feed Returns – Process Evaluation**11.1 Description:**

The Daily Usage Feed Returns Process Evaluation is an operational analysis of the usage return process and related documentation used by BST to accept, investigate and where necessary, correct Daily Usage Feed return requests from CLECs. Additionally, the daily usage feed return process will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

11.2 Objectives:

The objective of this evaluation is to determine the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of the processes and documentation used to process and respond to Daily Usage Feed Return requests.

11.3 Entrance Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|-----------------------------|
| All Global Entrance Criteria satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Documentation on Daily Usage Feed Returns Process available | BST |
| Interview and walk-through arrangements finalized | BST |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager /FPSC |

11.4 Test Scope:

The scope of this test includes the processes, sub-processes and measurements listed in the Table V-11 below.

Table V-11 Test Target: Daily Usage Feed Returns – Process Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Process Daily Usage Feed Returns Requests | Returned usage receipt | Completeness and accuracy of documentation and processes for creating, submitting and receiving returned usage | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Returned usage processing | Accuracy, completeness and timeliness of corrections | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Provision of status for all returned records | Accuracy, completeness and timeliness of status report | Inspections, report review | Qualitative Parity |
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

11.5 Scenarios:

Not applicable.

11.6 Test Approach:

The test will rely on the development of various evaluation checklists to facilitate a structured walk-through of the Daily Usage Feed Returns processes with BST representatives and to review process documentation.

The test may also include soliciting CLEC participation to gather data to help with the evaluation. The tester will observe the interactions of BST and CLECs submitting returns to verify that the procedures described by BST during the process evaluation are followed in practice. Inclusion of this segment of the test will be dependent on the availability of relevant CLEC data and examples.

11.6.1 Inputs

1. Detailed operational test plan
2. BST personnel to review procedures, systems and tools
3. Process documentation
4. Retail analogs (as applicable)

11.6.2 Activities

1. Prepare CLEC assistance solicitation materials
2. Select CLEC participants and arrange for observations
3. Observe Daily Usage Feed Returns process from CLEC perspective
4. Develop Daily Usage Feed Returns process evaluation checklist
5. Conduct process observations and interviews
6. Compile findings

11.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed Daily Usage Feed Returns Process Evaluation
2. Completed final report from the Daily Usage Feed Returns Process Evaluation

11.7 Exit Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| All Global Exit Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |

12.0 Test PPR12: Daily Usage Production and Distribution - Process Evaluation

12.1 Description:

The Daily Usage Production and Distribution Process Evaluation is an operational analysis of the processes and documentation used by BST to create and transmit the Daily Usage Feed (DUF).

12.2 Objectives:

The objective of this test is to determine the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of processes used to produce and distribute the DUF. Additionally, the daily usage feed production and distribution process will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

12.3 Entrance Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| All Global Entrance Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |
| Documentation on subject processes available | BST |
| Interview and walk-through arrangements finalized | BST |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |

12.4 Test Scope:

The scope of this test includes the processes, sub-processes and measurements listed in the Table V-12 below.

Table V-12 Test Target: Daily Usage Production and Distribution – Process Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--|---|--|--|--------------------|
| Produce Daily Usage Feed | Balancing and reconciliation of Daily Usage feed. | Completeness of balancing and reconciliation procedures | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Route Daily Usage | Controllability of usage | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Transmit Daily Usage Feed | Data transmission and cartridge tape delivery to CLEC | Completeness, consistency and timeliness of the process | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Maintain and Re-transmit Usage History | Create Daily Usage backup | Reliability of repeatable process | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Retrieve and re-transmit Daily Usage backup data | Availability and timeliness of prior period usage data to CLEC | Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

12.5 Scenarios:

Not applicable.

12.6 Test Approach

This test will use operational analysis techniques. It will rely on the development of various evaluation checklists to facilitate a structured walk-through of the daily usage production and distribution processes.

Arrangements will also be made to observe from a CLEC perspective the submission and BST responses to re-transmission requests.

--12.6.1 Inputs

1. Detailed operational test plan
2. BST personnel to review procedures, systems and tools
3. Process documentation
4. Availability of CLEC re-transmission test cases
5. Retail analogs (as applicable)

12.6.2 Activities

1. Develop Daily Usage Production and Distribution Process Evaluation checklist
2. Conduct process observations and interviews
3. Compile findings

12.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed Daily Usage Production and Distribution Process Evaluation
2. Completed final report from the Daily Usage Production and Distribution Process Evaluation

12.7 Exit Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| All Global Exit Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |

13.0 Test PPR13: Bill Production and Distribution - Process Evaluation**13.1 Description:**

The Bill Production Process Evaluation is an operational analysis of the processes employed by BST to produce and distribute carrier bills.

13.2 Objectives:

The objective of this test is to determine whether the processes employed by BST to produce and distribute carrier bills ensure that those bills are accurate and are distributed to CLECs on a timely basis. The processes that enable a CLEC to request and obtain copies of previously received bills are also tested. Additionally, the bill production and distribution processes will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

13.3 Entrance Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| All Global Entrance Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |
| Documentation on subject processes available | BST |
| Interview and walk-through arrangements finalized | BST |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |

13.4 Test Scope:

The scope of this test includes the processes, sub-processes and measurements listed in the Table V-13 below.

Table V-13 Test Target: Bill Production and Distribution - Process Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Balance Cycle | Define balancing and reconciliation procedures | Completeness and effectiveness of bill balancing and reconciliation procedures | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Produce Control Reports | Completeness and accuracy in generation of control elements | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Release cycle | Compliance to balancing and reconciliation procedures | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Deliver Bill | Delivery of bill media | Timeliness and controls of media delivery | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Maintain Bill History | Maintain billing information | Timeliness and controllability of billing information | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| | Access billing information | Accessibility and availability of billing information | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Request Resend | | Timeliness and accuracy of the delivery | Inspections | Qualitative Parity |
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

13.5 Scenarios:

Not applicable.

13.6 Test Approach

This test will use operational analysis techniques. It will rely on the development of various evaluation checklists to facilitate a structured walk-through of the bill production and delivery processes.

13.6.1 Inputs

1. Detailed operational test plan.
2. BST personnel to review procedures, systems and tools.
3. Process documentation.
4. Retail analogs (as applicable) .

13.6.2 Activities

1. Develop Bill Production and Distribution Process Evaluation checklist
2. Conduct process observations and interviews.
3. Compile findings.

13.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed Bill Production and Distribution Process Evaluation.
2. Completed final report from the Bill Production and Distribution Process Evaluation.

13.7 Exit Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| All Global Exit Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |

14.0 Test PPR14: End-to-End M&R Process Evaluation**14.1 Description**

This test will evaluate the functional equivalence of M&R processing for wholesale and retail trouble reports, by reviewing and evaluating the wholesale and retail process flow.

14.2 Objective

The objectives of this test are to evaluate BellSouth's wholesale M&R process, and the equivalence of BellSouth's end-to-end processes for trouble reporting and repair of retail and wholesale services. The end to end maintenance and repair process also will be compared with retail practices for parity, to the extent that specific retail analogs are identified.

14.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| Global entrance criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Wholesale & Retail M&R process flow documentation | BST |
| Process Evaluation Checklists | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview Guides | Phase II Test Manager |
| Retail analogs | Phase II Test Manager/FPSC |

14.4 Test Scope

Table V-14 Test Target: End-to-End M&R Process Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| End-to-End M&R Process: Resale | Process Flow Documentation | Comparison with Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Process Evaluation | Completeness, consistency and timeliness of the process | Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| End-to-End M&R Process: UNE/UNE Combinations | Process Flow Documentation | Comparison with Retail | Inspection | Parity |
| | Process Evaluation | Completeness, consistency and timeliness of the process | Inspection | Qualitative Parity |
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

14.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

14.6 Test Approach

14.6.1 Inputs

1. Retail and wholesale M&R process flow documentation
2. Other procedural documentation
3. Evaluation Checklists
4. Interview Guides
5. Retail analogs (as applicable)

14.6.2 Activities

1. Review and compare wholesale and retail process flows.
2. Identify differences between the two processes.
3. Analyze process
4. Assess the potential impact of each difference if possible.
5. Document process flow analysis results.

14.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed evaluation checklists and interview summaries
2. Summary report

14.7 Exit Criteria:

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| All Global Exit Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |

15.0 Test PPR15: M&R Work Center Support Evaluation

15.1 Description

The M&R work center support evaluation is an operational analysis of the work center/help desk processes developed by BellSouth to provide support to CLECs with questions, problems, and issues related to wholesale trouble reporting and repair operations.

15.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to evaluate the effectiveness of M&R work center support operations and adherence to common support center/help desk procedures. An additional objective is to analyze the nature and frequency of problems referred to the work center to determine if they indicate potential problems in other M&R Domain areas (e.g. TAFI).

Specifically, this evaluation is designed to:

- Determine adequacy, completeness and consistency of work center/help desk processes and procedures
- Determine whether expedite and escalation procedures are correctly documented and work effectively
- Ensure existence of reasonable security measures to ensure integrity of work center/help desk data and the ability to restrict access to parties with specific access permissions
- Determine the timeliness and accuracy in identifying and resolving problems
- Determine the existence and functionality of procedures for measuring, tracking, projecting and maintaining work center/help desk performance
- Determine the existence of Maintenance and Repair coordination processes and procedures, and other operational elements associated with M&R coordination activities between BellSouth and CLEC operations organizations.

15.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global entrance criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Process Evaluation Checklist | Phase II Test Manager |
| Interview Guides | Phase II Test Manager |
| Required data and documentation provided | BST |

15.4 Test Scope

Table V-15 Test Target: Work Center Support Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Call Processing | Call Answer | Timeliness | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Call Logging | Accuracy Completeness Consistency | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Prioritization | Existence Effectiveness | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| Problem Tracking and Resolution | Documentation | Clarity Accuracy | Document Review Interviews | Qualitative |

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| | Identify and Resolve | Timeliness Accuracy Completeness Consistency | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Track Problem | Existence Accuracy | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Log Status and Close | Accuracy Completeness Consistency | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Notify Customer | Timeliness | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| Expedite/ Escalation Procedures | Documentation | Existence Adequacy Accuracy | Document Review Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Call Answer | Accessability Timeliness | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Escalation Logging | Accuracy | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Identify and Resolve | Timeliness | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Log Status and Close | Accuracy | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| | Notify Customer | Timeliness | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| Work Center Procedures | | Accuracy Completeness | Inspections Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| Joint Meet Procedures | Process Documentation | Accuracy Completeness | Interviews Document Review | Qualitative |
| | Notification Procedures | Timeliness Accuracy | Interviews | Qualitative |
| Coordinated Testing | Process Documentation | Accuracy Completeness | Interviews Document Review | Qualitative |
| | Notification Procedures | Timeliness Accuracy | Interviews | Qualitative |
| Manual Handling — Resale | | Accuracy Timeliness Consistency | Observation Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| Manual Handling — UNE/UNE Combinations | | Accuracy Timeliness Consistency | Observation Logging Interviews | Qualitative |
| Capacity Management | Capacity management process | Adequacy and completeness of capacity management process | Inspection Document review Interview | Qualitative Parity |

15.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

15.6 Test Approach

15.6.1 Inputs

1. Interview guides
2. Observation checklists
3. Work center/help desk evaluation checklists
4. Work center contact logs
5. Process and procedure documentation
6. BST notification procedures for coordinated repair meetings and coordinated repair testing

15.6.2 Test Activities

1. Conduct Maintenance and Repair center visits
2. Conduct work center/help desk evaluations
3. Establish work center contact logs
4. Analyze and collate contacts by type

15.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed checklists from the work center/help desk evaluations
2. Summary Report
3. Contact analysis results report

15.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Global exit criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-4 |

16.0 Test PPR16: Network Surveillance Support Evaluation

16.1 Description

The network surveillance support evaluation is a review of the processes and other operational elements associated with BellSouth's network surveillance and network

outage notification processes and procedures as they relate to wholesale operations. It also involves a review of the procedures followed by the INSAC and NRC.

16.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to determine the functionality of network surveillance and network outage notification procedures and to assess the performance capabilities of network outage notification procedures for wholesale operations.

16.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Global entrance criteria have been met | See Table III-3 |

16.4 Test Scope

Table V-16 Test Target: Network Surveillance Support Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Network Surveillance | IOF Surveillance | Existence Reliability | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| | AIN Interconnect Surveillance | Existence Reliability | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| | SS7 Interconnect Surveillance | Existence Reliability | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| Outage Notification | Process Documentation | Accuracy Completeness | Inspection | Qualitative |
| | Notification Procedures | Timeliness Accuracy Completeness | Inspection | Qualitative |

16.5 Scenarios

This test does not rely on scenarios.

16.6 Test Approach

16.6.1 Inputs

1. Operational analysis plan and task checklist
2. Evaluation guides
3. Interview Guides
4. Documentation of all notification and network surveillance procedures for wholesale
5. Designated personnel for interviews

16.6.2 Activities

1. Using the operational analysis plan, conduct process analysis
2. Conduct documentation review
3. Conduct procedure interviews
4. Develop and document findings

16.6.3 Outputs

1. Completed checklists and interview summaries
2. Operations review report
3. Procedures review report

16.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-4 |

VI. Transaction Verification and Validation Test Section

A. Purpose

The purpose of this section is to describe the specific tests to be undertaken in evaluating the systems, and other operational elements associated with BST's support for application-to-application, manual, and GUI (graphical user interface) transactions. The tests are designed to evaluate BST's compliance to measurement agreements, ensure documented functionality exists and works properly, and provide a basis for comparing the operational areas to BST's Retail Operations.

B. Organization

The Transaction Verification and Validation (TVV) test family is organized into three sections that represent the key focus areas for testing in this domain. These three sections are:

- Pre-Ordering, Ordering, Provisioning (POP) Transactions
- Maintenance and Repair (M&R) Transactions
- Billing Transactions

The test targets are further defined in the 'scope' section. The test processes are further defined in the 'test processes' section.

C. Scope

As identified above, the Transaction Verification and Validation test family is comprised of three test sections, representing important and generally distinct areas of effort undertaken by BST. The three test target sections will verify and validate BST's ability to support systems and processes that enable transaction processing.

Each test section is broken down into a number of increasingly discrete Tests, Processes, and Sub-Process Areas that serve a particular area of interest within the test section.

D. Test Processes

Eleven tests have been designed to address the three test sections. The organization of the subject test processes is as follows:

- TVV1: POP Functional Evaluation
- TVV2: POP Volume Performance Tests
- TVV3: Order Flow Through Evaluation

- TVV4: Provisioning Verification and Validation
- TVV5: M&R TAFI Functional Evaluation
- TVV6: M&R ECTA Functional Evaluation
- TVV7: M&R TAFI Performance Evaluation
- TVV8: M&R ECTA Performance Evaluation
- TVV9: End-to-End Trouble Report Processing
- TVV10: Billing Functional Usage Evaluation
- TVV 11: Functional Carrier Bill Evaluation

1.0 Test TVV1: POP Functional Evaluation

1.1 Description

The POP Functional Evaluation is a comprehensive review of all of the functional elements of Pre-Ordering, Ordering, and Provisioning; the achievement of the prescribed measures; and an analysis of performance in comparison to BST's Retail systems. The Phase II Test Manager will examine BellSouth's conformance documented specifications, and an analysis of its functional comparison to BellSouth's Wholesale and Retail systems. The test has two phases, a basic functional evaluation, and a comparative functional evaluation.

The test will include the submission of live transactions over three BST-supported interfaces: 1) interactively via graphical user interfaces, 2) machine-machine interfaces, and 3) manually. In addition to the manual submission of orders, current plans call for testing the following electronic BST interfaces: LENS99, TAG, and EDI. TAG consists of two interfaces: 1) RoboTAG—current name for the GUI TAG interface, and 2) TAG—the name of the machine-machine interface. In addition, LENS99 will also be based on the TAG architecture but will continue to have the "look and feel" of the current LENS interface.

The following table depicts the functionality and mechanism with which each interface will be tested:

| System | Pre-Order | | | Order | | |
|--------|-----------|-----------------|--------|-------|-----------------|--------|
| | GUI | Machine-Machine | Manual | GUI | Machine-Machine | Manual |
| LENS99 | X | | | X | | |
| TAG | X | X | | X | X | |
| EDI | | | | | X | |
| Manual | | | X | | | X |

The master interface list will be finalized during Phase II to allow for any corrections/additions to be made as actual testing nears.

The machine-machine interfaces will be tested using interfaces built by/for the Phase II Test Manager according to specifications and processes provided to CLECs by BellSouth. The GUI will be tested through transactions entered directly into the appropriate GUI interface. Manual transactions will be submitted as well.

Data on all of the POP processes will be collected and analyzed and used to produce the output reports. The POP Functional Evaluation will look at an end-to-end view of the

pre-ordering through provisioning process. It will include a mix of stand-alone pre-ordering and ordering transactions, along with pre-order transactions followed by orders, supplements, and cancels. The Phase II Test Manager will collect data on transaction submissions and responses, and on provisioning activities. Where possible and appropriate, this information will be collected and maintained electronically. Both ASR and LSR orders will be tested. Erred as well as error free transactions will be tested. Not all orders will go through the physical provisioning process. Some will be future dated, and others will be canceled before provisioning activities commence. The verification and validation of the provisioning activities will be performed in TVV4.

As part of the POP Functional Evaluation, the Phase II Test Manager will also seek qualitative input and quantitative data on the "real world" experience of CLECs operating in Florida. CLECs willing to participate in this test will be interviewed and their experiences will be incorporated into the test results after validation by the Phase II Test Manager. In addition, for some types of transactions, involvement will be sought from willing CLECs to participate in some aspects of the live transaction testing. This will be done for two principal purposes.

First, CLEC participation will be important for complex orders that cannot be simulated adequately in the Certified Software Interface test environment. Examples include complex facilities-based orders and orders, like those for unbundled loops with LNP, which require an actual CLEC switch to fully complete. Second, it is important to attempt to incorporate information to help control for "experiment bias" of the results. Therefore, the Phase II Test Manager will ask CLECs for data that can be validated on live orders that replicate those sent over the test systems. As appropriate, some test orders may be sent over CLEC systems.

Of course, successful completion of all of these aspects of the test requires active participation of one or more CLECs. However, CLEC participation is voluntary and the scope of that participation is up to each individual CLEC.

1.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to validate the existence, functionality, and behavior of the interfaces and processes required by BST for pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning transaction requests and responses.

1.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|-----------------------------|
| All global entrance criteria | See Table III-3 |
| Interfaces are built and tested | Phase II Test Manager |
| BST Interfaces are "certified" by BellSouth | BST |
| Initial BST measurement evaluation completed | Phase II Test Manager, FPSC |
| BST measurements available at the CLEC level | BST |
| Measurement collection process is defined | Phase II Test Manager |
| Dial-up connectivity to GUI interface established | Phase II Test Manager, BST |

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| Test bed databases and facilities in place | BST |
| CLEC test volunteers identified | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test Scenarios developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test Cases developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Specific Test Cases to test in conjunction with CLEC volunteers identified | Phase II Test Manager |
| Functional Checklist created | Phase II Test Manager |
| Specific Evaluation techniques developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Evaluation Criteria defined and approved | Phase II Test Manager |
| Detailed "Go/No Go" checklist created | Phase II Test Manager |
| Help Desk log and contact checklists created | Phase II Test Manager |

1.4 Test Scope

Ordering transactions consists of three distinct, but related, processes:

- Pre-Order Processing—submission of requests for information required to complete orders;
- Order Processing—submission of orders required to add/delete/change a customer's service; and
- Provisioning—physical work performed by BST as a result of the submitted orders.

The Ordering Transactions test suite will be comprised of "real-life", end-to-end test cases that cover the entire spectrum of pre-order, order, and provisioning. The following order types will be tested:

- Migrate "as is"
- Migrate "as specified"
- New customer
- Feature Change
- Directory Change
- Number Change
- Add lines
- Suspend/Restore
- Disconnect (full/partial)
- Move (inside/outside)

- Number Portability (LNP/INP)
- Line reclassification
- Change to New Local Service Provider
- UNE Loop Cut Over

The order types identified above will be ordered using the available and applicable BellSouth service delivery methods. The following service delivery methods will be tested:

- Resale
- Unbundled Loops
- UNE Combinations
- Other Unbundled Network Elements, including xDSL capable Loops
- Any other service delivery methods that may become available at the time of the test

The orders will be placed using BellSouth's existing interfaces: GUI, machine-machine, and manual. The following assumptions pertain to ordering interfaces:

- Orders and pre-orders will be sent over every applicable in-scope interface,
- Orders will be issued using both the ASR and LSR format, as appropriate, and
- The GUI will be tested from multiple terminals at the same time.

Other important aspects of ordering will be tested:

- "Flow through" order types, as stated and agreed-to by BellSouth, will be tested to ensure that they do not require manual handling,
- Supplemental orders (changes to orders in process), including cancels, will be tested,
- Multiple products and features will be tested; the tests will cover a broad range of the options available to CLECs and resellers,
- Multiple switch-types, end-offices and cities will be included in the test,
- A portion of the orders sent will be physically provisioned. Some orders will be future dated, allowing them to be canceled prior to work scheduling and provisioning, and

- CLECs will be solicited for involvement in some aspects of the test, especially for assistance in the testing of complex services and services with long lead times.

In addition to normal orders, orders with planned errors will be sent to BellSouth to check the accuracy of its system edits and LCSC (Local Carrier Service Center) representatives.

Service locations supported by different BST ordering, provisioning, and CO switching and transmission configurations will be tested.

The test will be conducted using the most current release of the BellSouth business rules at the time of the test. BellSouth's scheduled release of OSS '99, planned for December 1999, incorporates functionality from LSOG2, LSOG3, and LSOG4 reflecting the priority items requested by the CLEC community. Any BST updates to these rules released during the test period will be incorporated into the remaining orders, which may cause delays. In addition, any interface business rules and format changes necessitated during the course of the test to conduct the test scenarios stated in Appendix A, and which may lead to a Change Control initiative, will be included in the test transaction formats.

Documentation affecting the POP domain given to the CLECs and the resellers – including the LEO volume set, training materials, and other appropriate documentation – will be used to submit the transactions, and the accuracy and usefulness of this documentation will be evaluated.

The following chart (applicable to TVV1, TVV2, TVV3, and TVV4) contains the processes and sub-processes that will be used in evaluating BST's pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning functionality and performance:

Table VI-1 POP Processes

| Process Area | Sub-Process |
|--------------|---|
| Pre-ordering | Retrieve customer CSR from CRIS |
| | Validate Customer Address |
| | Reserve and release telephone numbers |
| | Request information about services, features, facilities, and PIC/LPIC choices available to customers |
| | Determine due date/appointment availability |
| Ordering | Submit an order for the migration of a customer from BST to a CLEC "as is" |
| | Submit an order for the migration of a customer from BST to a customer "as specified" |
| | Submit an order for the partial migration of a customer from BST to a CLEC |
| | Submit an order for establishing service for a new customer of a CLEC |
| | Submit an order for feature changes to an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for adding lines/circuits to an existing CLEC customer. |
| | Submit an order for a telephone number change for an existing CLEC customer |

| Process Area | Sub-Process |
|--------------|---|
| | Submit an order for a directory change for an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for an inside move of an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for the outside move of an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for suspending service of an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for restoring service to an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for disconnecting service from an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for disconnecting some lines/circuits for an existing CLEC customer |
| | Submit an order for migration of a customer from another CLEC |
| | Change service delivery method for an existing CLEC customer |
| | Order interoffice facilities |
| | Receive order confirmation |
| Provisioning | Receive notification of jeopardy or delay |
| | Receive completion notification |

BST's pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning functionality and performance:

Table VI-2 POP Evaluation Measures

| Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Clarity, accuracy and completeness of documentation | Document Review, Transaction Generation | Qualitative Quantitative |
| Accessibility of GUI (excluding Interoffice facilities) | Transaction Generation | Quantitative |
| Accessibility of machine-machine (excluding Interoffice Facilities) | Transaction Generation | Quantitative |
| Accessibility of manual processing (excluding Interoffice facilities) | Transaction Generation | Quantitative |
| Accuracy and completeness of functionality | Transaction Generation | Quantitative |
| Timeliness of response | Logging | Quantitative |
| Accuracy and completeness of response | Transaction Generation, Inspection | Qualitative Quantitative |
| Clarity and accuracy of error messages | Transaction Generation, Inspection, Document Review | Quantitative |
| Accuracy, responsiveness, and completeness of Help Desk support | Transaction Generation, Logging | Qualitative Quantitative |
| Usability of information | Transaction Generation, Inspection | Qualitative Quantitative |
| Consistency with retail capability | Inspection | Qualitative Quantitative |

The Provisioning process has different measures:

Table VI-3 Provisioning Evaluation Measures

| Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Timeliness of provisioning | Transaction Generation, Inspection, Logging | Quantitative Qualitative |

| Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Frequency of delay or rescheduling of provisioning | Transaction Generation, Inspection, Logging | Quantitative Qualitative |
| Accuracy and completeness of provisioning | Transaction Generation, Inspection, Logging | Quantitative Qualitative |

1.5 Scenarios

The specific scenarios to be used in this test can be found in Appendix A.

1.6 Test Approach

1.6.1 Inputs

1. Test scenarios and cases
2. Test case execution schedule
3. Certified interfaces
4. Documentation (LEO guides, order/pre-order business rules, etc.)
5. Trained personnel to execute test cases
6. Test "Go/No Go" checklist
7. Help Desk log and contact checklists

1.6.2 Activities

1. Determine functionality of both BST wholesale and retail ordering, preordering, and provisioning systems.
2. Compare wholesale and retail functionality.
3. Use test cases to develop transactions and transaction content based upon instructions provided in the appropriate handbook(s).
4. Interview CLEC volunteers and coordinate joint testing activities.
5. Submit transactions. Submittal date and time and appropriate transaction information logged.
6. Receive transaction responses. Receipt date, time, response transaction type, and response condition (valid vs. reject) logged.
7. Match transaction response to original transaction.
8. Verify transaction response contains expected data and flags unplanned errors.

9. Manually review unexpected errors. Identify error source (the Phase II Test Manager, or BST). Identify and log reason for the error. Determine if test should be discontinued.
10. Contact help desk for support as indicated in test cases and for unexpected errors following the appropriate resolution procedures. Log response time, availability, and other behavior of functions as identified on the help desk checklist.
11. Correct expected errors and resubmit. Re-submittal date, time, and appropriate information logged.
12. Identify transactions for which responses have not been received. Where multiple responses are expected for the same request, the receipt of each response will be monitored.
13. Record missing responses.
14. Review status of pending orders. Verify and record accuracy of response.
15. Generate Certified Software Interface reports.
16. Generate BST metrics report for test date range.
17. Compare Certified Software Interface metrics to BST retail metrics.

1.6.3 Outputs

1. A Summary report comparing the relative functionality of BST's Wholesale and Retail ordering, preordering, and provisioning systems.
2. Reports that provide the metrics to support the standards of performance defined in Appendix D.
3. Variance between actual performance and the standards of performance defined in Appendix D.
4. Report of expected results versus actual test case results
5. Unplanned error count by type and percentage of total
6. Report of unplanned errors as the result of documentation problems
7. Rejects received after confirmation notification and percentage of total

8. Transaction counts, error ratio, response time, etc., by transaction type, product family, and delivery method
9. Minimum, maximum, mean, average, and aggregate response time/interval per transaction set
10. Transaction counts per response time/interval range per transaction set
11. Orders erred after initial confirmation
12. "Flow through" orders by order type, product family, etc.
13. Completed help desk logs and checklists
14. Help desk accuracy and timeliness report
15. CSI measurement reports
16. Measure of parity performance between retail and wholesale

1.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria | See Table III-4 |

2.0 Test TVV2: POP Volume Performance Tests

2.1 Description

The Volume Performance Test will identify the capacity and potential choke points, at projected future transaction volumes, of the BST GUI, manual, and machine-machine interfaces and BST systems and processes for responding to pre-ordering queries and for initial processing of orders. There will be three parts to the test: 1) a "normal volume" test using anticipated transaction volumes for the July 2001 time frame, 2) a "peak" test using volumes at 150% (1.5 times) of the normal volume test, and 3) a "stress" test using volumes at 250% (2.5 times) of the normal volume test. The "normal volume" and "peak" tests will be conducted in BellSouth's production environment.

The Volume Performance Test will look at the performance of BST's pre-ordering and ordering systems and processes from the submission of queries to the creation of internal service orders and the return of an order confirmation. The orders submitted in the Volume Performance Test will not go through the physical provisioning process. The test will include a mix of stand-alone pre-ordering and ordering transactions. Included in this mix will be planned errors—both business rules errors and flow-through drop-out errors. Transactions will be submitted using the manual, GUI, and machine-machine interfaces.

While transactions will be submitted throughout the entire transaction test period as part of the POP Functional Evaluation, the volume tests will only run on certain days during the testing period. There will be two 24-hour "normal volume" days of testing. There will be one 24-hour "peak" test. There will be one 4-hour, off-peak "stress" test. The "stress" test will be run off-peak to limit the impact of the test on real customers. All the attributes and activities that apply to the POP Functional Evaluation for pre-ordering and ordering also apply to this test.

2.2 Objective

The objective of the Volume Performance Test is to measure BST's capability and identify potential choke points of the manual, GUI, and machine-machine interfaces and systems put in place to access pre-ordering information and submit orders to BST at projected future volumes.

2.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------------|
| All global entrance criteria | See Table III-3 |
| All TVV1 entrance criteria | See Table VI-1.3 |
| Agreement on volumes and distribution by scenario and entry mode | Phase II Test Manager, FPSC |
| Test Scenarios selected | Phase II Test Manager |
| Specific Test Cases developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test Case execution schedule developed | Phase II Test Manager |

2.4 Test Scope

The scope for this test includes the following test processes:

1. Pre-Ordering
2. Order Processing

2.5 Scenarios

The specific scenarios to be used in this test will be chosen from those found in Appendix A.

2.6 Test Approach

2.6.1 Inputs

1. Test cases
2. Test case execution schedule
3. Documentation (LEO guides, pre-ordering/ordering business rules, etc.)
4. Personnel to execute test cases
5. Test "Go/No Go" Checklist

6. Help Desk log and contact checklists
7. Certified interfaces

2.6.2 Activities

1. Use test cases to develop transactions and transaction content based upon instructions provided in the appropriate handbook(s).
2. Submit transactions. Submittal date, time and appropriate transaction information are logged.
3. Receive transaction responses. Receipt date, time, response transaction type, and response condition (valid vs. reject) are logged.
4. Match transaction response to original transaction. Verify matching transaction can be found and record mismatches.
5. Verify transaction response contains expected data and flag unplanned errors.
6. Manually review unplanned errors. Identify error source (Phase II Test Manager or BST). Identify and log reason for the error. Determine if test should be discontinued.
7. Contact help desk for support as indicated in test cases and for unexpected errors following the appropriate resolution procedures. Log response time, availability, and other behavior of functions as identified on the help desk checklist.
8. Identify transactions for which responses have not been received. Where multiple responses are expected for the same request, the receipt of each response will be monitored. Record missing responses.
9. Review status of pending orders. Verify and record accuracy of response.
10. Generate CSI reports.
11. Compare CSI metrics to BST detail metrics. Review CSI BST measures.

2.6.3 Outputs

1. Reports that provide performance metrics
2. Variance between actual performance and standards of performance

3. Report of expected results versus actual results
4. Unplanned error count by type and percentage of total
5. Report of Unplanned errors as the result of documentation problems
6. Transaction counts, error ratio, response time, etc. by transaction type, product family and delivery method
7. Minimum, maximum, mean, average, and aggregate response time/interval per transaction set
8. Transaction counts per response time/interval range per transaction set
9. Orders erred after initial confirmation
10. Completed help desk logs and checklists
11. Help desk accuracy and timeliness report
12. Measure of parity performance between retail and wholesale
13. Summary Report

2.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria | See Table III-4 |

3.0 Test TVV3: Order "Flow Through" Evaluation

3.1 Description

The Order "Flow Through" Evaluation tests the ability of orders to flow through from the CLEC through the interface into the BST ordering system, SOCS, without any human intervention. Only orders that qualify as "flow through", orders not needing manual action, will be tested. The list of "flow through" types will be updated during the testing period. Additions and deletions to the list will be incorporated into the test.

As appropriate, "flow through" orders will be submitted through the GUI, and machine-machine interfaces. Any supplements and cancels that are considered to be "flow through" will also be submitted. The order transactions will be monitored to verify that they do not "fall out" for manual handling in the BST work center.

As a separate part of this test, the Phase II Test Manager will conduct an analysis of the BST retail ordering functionality. Based on this analysis, a comparison of the "flow through" capabilities of the retail and wholesale systems will be made.

This test will be conducted as a part of the POP functional and normal volume testing (TVV1, TVV2)

3.2 Objective

The objective of the Order "Flow Through" Test is to verify the ability of BST to flow through their front end systems, without manual intervention, all order types that at the time the transactions are submitted as designated by BST or otherwise considered to be "flow through".

3.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| All global entrance criteria | See Table III-3 |
| All TVV1 entrance criteria | See Table VI-1.3 |
| Documentation specifying which orders are expected to flow through | BST |
| Test Scenarios selected | Phase II Test Manager |
| Specific Test Cases developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test Case execution schedule developed | Phase II Test Manager |

3.4 Test Scope

The scope for this test includes the following test processes:

1. Ordering

3.5 Scenarios

The specific scenarios to be used in this test will be chosen from those that can be found in Appendix A.

3.6 Test Approach

3.6.1 Inputs

1. Test Cases and expected results
2. Test case execution schedule
3. Interfaces built and certified
4. Trained personnel to execute test cases
5. Test "Go/No Go" checklist
6. BST flow through documentation

3.6.2 Activities

1. Compare order flow through capabilities of BST wholesale and retail systems.
2. Submit order transactions. Log submittal date, time and appropriate transaction information.

3. Receive transaction responses. Log receipt date, time, response transaction type, and response condition (valid vs. reject).
4. Verify transaction response contains expected data and flags unplanned errors.
5. Identify orders that had manual handling. Identify reason for manual handling. Record manual handling and order attributes.
6. If there was an error that caused the order not to flow through, identify error source (Phase II Test Manager or BST). Identify and log reason for the error. BST errors will not be corrected by the Phase II Test Manager.
7. Correct any Phase II Test Manager errors and re-submit. Verify orders now flow through.
8. Verify that all orders submitted are accounted for. Log any orders that are submitted but do not appear as processed or erred by BST.
9. Generate BST manual handling report.
10. Generate CSI reports.
11. Compare CSI reports to BST Retail metrics.

3.6.3 Outputs

1. A summary report comparing the order flow through capabilities of BST's Wholesale and Retail systems.
2. Percentage and number of orders that flowed through by order type, product family, etc.
3. Percentage and number of orders that did not flow through by order type, product family, etc.
4. Orders that did not flow through by reason code
5. Variance between actual performance and the standards of performance defined in various arbitrated agreements
6. Report of expected results versus actual results
7. Report of orders not processed
8. BST manual handling report
9. Summary Report

3.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria | See Table III-4 |

4.0 Test TVV4: Provisioning Verification and Validation

4.1 Description

The Provisioning Verification and Validation test is a comprehensive review of BST's ability to complete accurately and expeditiously the provisioning of CLEC orders. This test will be conducted as a part of the POP functional testing (TVV1). It will incorporate orders submitted via the following interfaces: manual, machine-machine, and GUI. While most kinds of orders will be included, the test will concentrate on those types of orders that require physical provisioning.

This test will involve verifying that orders submitted have been properly provisioned and that the provisioning has been completed on time. Included in the test will be orders that have been supplemented and canceled, as well as those submitted with anticipated errors, to test the impact on provisioning.

For some orders, particularly the more complex ones, the involvement of CLECs operating in Florida will be solicited to volunteer use of their facilities to enhance the "real world" nature of the test. The CLECs will also be asked to provide data on their experiences with provisioning, after verification and validation by Phase II Test Manager.

4.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to evaluate the ability of BST to accurately provision orders submitted by CLECs and to do so on time.

4.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| All global entrance criteria | See Table III-3 |
| All TVV1 entrance criteria | See Table IV-1.3 |
| Test Scenarios selected | Phase II Test Manager |
| Specific Test Cases developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| CLEC volunteers identified | Phase II Test Manager |
| Provisioning log and activity checklists created | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test case execution schedule developed | Phase II Test Manager |

4.4 Test Scope

The scope for this test includes the following processes:

1. Pre-Ordering
2. Order Processing

3. Provisioning

4.5 Scenarios

The specific scenarios to be used in this test will be chosen from those that can be found in Appendix A.

4.6 Test Approach

4.6.1 Inputs

1. Test Cases and expected results
2. Test case execution schedule
3. Provisioning documentation
4. Provisioning log and activity checklists
5. Trained personnel to execute test cases
6. Test "Go/No Go" checklist

4.6.2 Activities

1. Use test cases to develop transactions and transaction content based upon instructions provided in the appropriate documentation
2. Submit machine-machine transactions.
3. Submit GUI and manual transactions.
4. Receive confirmations of transactions.
5. Log notification of provisioning jeopardies and delays.
6. Perform joint provisioning activities and record provisioning interactions.
7. Perform testing on provisioned services.
8. Test completion on orders. Record results in appropriate provisioning log and activity checklist.
9. Generate CSI reports.
10. Compare CSI metrics with BST retail and other CLECs.

4.6.3 Outputs

1. Reports that provide the metrics to support standards of performance listed in Appendix D.

2. Variance between actual performance and standards of performance listed in Appendix D.
3. Report of expected results versus actual test case results.
4. Completed provisioning logs and checklists
5. Help desk accuracy and timeliness report
6. Provisioning accuracy and timeliness report
7. CSI to other CLEC comparison
8. Measure of parity performance between retail and wholesale

4.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| All global exit criteria | See Table III-4 |

5.0 Test TVV5: M&R TAFI Functional Evaluation

5.1 Description

The Trouble Analysis Facilitation Interface (TAFI) Functional Evaluation is a comprehensive review of all of the functional elements of the TAFI System, their conformance to documented specifications, and an analysis of its functionality in comparison to BellSouth's Retail Residence and Business TAFI. The test has two major phases, Phase 1 — a basic functional evaluation, and Phase 2 — a comparative functional evaluation.

5.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to validate the existence and behavior of TAFI functional elements as documented in CLEC TAFI Training Guides and other applicable documents, and to evaluate the equivalence of CLEC TAFI functionality to BellSouth Residence and Business TAFI.

5.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Detailed Test Plan completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test Scenarios selected | Phase II Test Manager |
| Specific Test Cases and Transaction Sets developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| Basic documentation review completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Detailed Functional Checklist created | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test bed of working services selected and/or established | BST |
| Specific Evaluation techniques developed | Phase II Test Manager |

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|-----------------------|
| Physical access to BellSouth Web site established | BST |
| Security access to TAFI established | BST |
| Evaluation Criteria defined and approved | FPSC |
| Checklists and Interview Guides created | Phase II Test Manager |

5.4 Test Scope

CLEC TAFI functionality will be reviewed within the context of specific documentation addressing its use and in comparison to BST's retail Residence and Business TAFI. The following chart contains the processes, sub-processes, and methods for evaluating the functionality of TAFIs:

Table VI-4 Test Target: M&R TAFI Functional Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Trouble Reporting | Create/Enter Trouble Report (TR) | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative Parity |
| | Modify TR | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative Parity |
| | Close/Cancel TR | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative Parity |
| | Retrieve TR Status | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative Parity |
| Trouble History Access | Retrieve Trouble History | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative Parity |
| Access To Test Capability | Initiate MLT Test | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative Parity |
| | Receive MLT Test Results | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative Parity |
| Functionality | Functional Equivalence to TAFI | Existence of Specific Function | Inspection Interviews | Parity Qualitative |

5.5 Scenarios

A subset of the Appendix A scenarios will be used in this test.

5.6 Test Approach

This test is broken down into two phases:

- Phase 1 involves the use of test cases created for this test to evaluate CLEC TAFI functionality and to determine if the system behaves as documented.
- Phase 2 involves observation and interviews of Retail Maintenance Administrators (MA) processing trouble calls and entering trouble reports into Residence and Business TAFI to assess functionality in comparison to CLEC TAFI.

5.6.1 Inputs

1. Test cases
2. Documentation (TAFI Student Guide, etc.)
3. Functionality checklists
4. Interview guide
5. Personnel to execute test cases
6. Personnel to interview Retail Maintenance Administrators and observe their use of Residence and Business TAFI.

5.6.2 Activities – Phase 1

1. Use test cases created for this test and appropriate BellSouth documentation to perform each of the functions listed on the checklist provided via the TAFI GUI interface.
2. Verify that each system function behaves as documented.
3. Note any anomalies in the space provided on the checklist.
4. Note any discrepancies between TAFI documentation and behavior.
5. Ensure that all trouble reports entered in TAFI have been canceled.

5.6.3 Activities – Phase 2

1. Use the checklist and interview guide to conduct interviews with MA's selected from the Residence and Business M&R work centers.
2. Observe MA trouble report activities as identified on the checklist provided.
3. Note the presence and behavior of functions identified on the checklist.
4. Identify any anomalies relative to the functions being observed.

5. Note any additional relevant information from the MA interview (e.g., additional capabilities, performance, etc.).
6. Determine and document any M&R functions that can be performed from a Retail Residence and Business TAFI Workstation that are not available in CLEC TAFI.
7. Perform a detailed evaluation of relative functionality and capabilities between CLEC TAFI and Retail Residence and Business TAFI.

5.6.5 Activities – Common

1. Document the results and findings from the activities conducted in Phases 1 and 2.

5.6.6 Outputs

1. Completed checklists from Phases 1 and 2 activities
2. Completed interview summaries
3. Summary reports of findings from each phase, including a discussion of anomalies and relevant observations relating to usability and timeliness of each system interface
4. A Summary report comparing relative functionality in CLEC TAFI and Retail Residence and Business TAFI highlighting differences and contrasting ease of use of the two systems in performing the functions observed

5.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global exit criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-4 |
| All activities completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Checklists and reports completed by personnel participating in the test. | Phase II Test Manager |

6.0 Test TVV6: M&R ECTA Functional Evaluation

6.1 Description

The Electronic Communication Trouble Administration (ECTA) Functional Evaluation is a comprehensive review of all of the functional elements of the ECTA System, their conformance to documented interface specifications, and an analysis of its functionality in comparison to M&R electronic bonding industry standards. The test has two major phases, Phase 1 — a basic functional evaluation, and Phase 2 — an industry standard comparison.

6.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to validate the existence and behavior of ECTA functional elements as documented for CLEC trouble entry and other applicable documents, and to evaluate the equivalence of the ECTA interface functionality to BellSouth documentation and industry standards for electronic bonding trouble entry systems.

6.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global Entrance Criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Detailed Test Plan completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test Scenarios selected | Phase II Test Manager |
| Specific Test Cases and Transaction Sets developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| Basic documentation review completed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Detailed Functional Checklist created | Phase II Test Manager |
| Test bed of working services selected and/or established | BST |
| Specific Evaluation techniques developed | Phase II Test Manager |
| Physical access to BellSouth Trouble entry site established | BST |
| Security access to ECTA established | BST |
| Evaluation Criteria defined and approved | FPSC |
| Checklists and Interview Guides created | Phase II Test Manager |

6.4 Test Scope

ECTA functionality will be reviewed within the context of specific documentation addressing M&R Trouble Entry in comparison to industry standards. The following chart contains the processes, sub-processes, and methods for evaluating the functionality of BST's ECTA interface: Methods of access will be tested using Internet access and the ECTA T1 interface.

Table VI-5 Test Target: M&R ECTA Functional Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Trouble Reporting | Create/Enter Trouble Report (TR) | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| | Modify TR | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| | Close/Cancel TR | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| | Retrieve TR Status | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Create non-designed TR | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| | Create complex and designed TR | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| Trouble History Access | Retrieve Trouble History | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| Access To Test Capability | Initiate MLT Test | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| | Receive MLT Test Results | Functionality exists as documented | Inspection | Existence Qualitative |
| Functionality | Functional Comparison to Industry Standards | Existence of Specific Function | Inspection Interviews Observations | Existence Qualitative |

6.5 Scenarios

A subset of the Appendix A scenarios will be used in this test.

6.6 Test Approach

This test is broken down into two phases:

- Phase 1 involves the use of test cases created for this test to evaluate ECTA functionality and to determine if the system behaves as documented.
- Phase 2 involves comparing the ECTA functionality against industry standards.

6.6.1 Inputs

1. Test cases
2. BellSouth documentation (TBD to be furnished by BST)
3. Documentation of industry standard requirements
4. Functionality checklists
5. Personnel to execute test cases

6.6.2 Activities – Phase 1

1. Use test cases created for this test and appropriate BellSouth documentation to perform each of the functions listed on the checklist provided via the ECTA interface.
2. Verify that each system function behaves as documented.
3. Note any anomalies in the space provided on the checklist.
4. Note any discrepancies between M&R Trouble Entry documentation and behavior of the ECTA interface.
5. Ensure that all trouble reports entered via the ECTA interface have been canceled.

6.6.3 Activities – Phase 2

1. Develop a list of verified ECTA functionality based on the results of Phase 1.
2. Develop a list of industry standard functionality.
3. Determine and document any M&R functions that do not meet industry standards.
4. Perform a detailed evaluation of relative functionality and capabilities between the ECTA interface and specified industry standards.

6.6.5 Activities – Common

1. Document the results and findings from the activities conducted in Phases 1 and 2.

6.6.6 Outputs

1. Completed checklists from Phases 1 and 2 activities
2. Completed interview summaries
3. Summary reports of findings from each phase, including a discussion of anomalies and relevant observations relating to usability and timeliness of each system interface
4. A Summary report comparing relative functionality the ECTA interface and industry standards highlighting differences

6.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global exit criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-4 |
| All activities completed | Phase II Test Manager |

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Checklists and reports completed by personnel participating in the test. | Phase II Test Manager |

7.0 Test TVV7: M&R TAFI Performance Evaluation

7.1 Description

The TAFI performance evaluation is a transaction driven test designed to evaluate the behavior of the TAFI system and its interfaces under load conditions. This test will be conducted twice. The first execution will use transaction sets established to simulate projected July 2001 volumes for peak busy hour and peak busy day operations. The second execution will use a multiple of the volumes used in the first execution.

7.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to evaluate the behavior of TAFI under load conditions, to determine system performance in terms of response time and operability, and to identify future performance bottlenecks.

7.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global entrance criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Certified Software Interface has been fully tested and is operational for the submission of test cases | CSI |
| Test transaction sets have been built and validated | Phase II Test Manager |
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| System test bed has been established | BST |
| TAFI test coordination details have been worked out | Phase II Test Manager |

7.4 Test Scope

TAFI performance will be evaluated under normal projected loads and in a stress/load test mode. The following chart contains the processes, sub-processes, and methods for evaluating the performance of BST's Residence and Business TAFI:

Table VI-6 Test Target: M&R TAFI Performance Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Performance | Projected Normal Loads | Timeliness Operability | Inspection Transaction Generation | Qualitative Quantitative |
| | Stress/Load | Timeliness Operability Capacity | Inspection Transaction Generation | Qualitative Quantitative |

7.5 Scenarios

A subset of the Appendix A scenarios will be used in this test.

7.6 Test Approach

Test transactions will be sent to TAFI. The transaction sets are structured to provide a transaction mix consistent with current system usage, projected normal volumes, and stress/load volumes. Submission rates should mirror peak busy hour and peak busy day behaviors.

7.6.1 Inputs

1. Test cases and transaction sets
2. Personnel to operate certified software interface.
3. Personnel to supervise and observe test execution
4. TAFI systems and associated test beds
5. Certified software interface

4.6.2 Activities

1. Feed transaction sets to TAFI
2. Periodically exercise TAFI functionality manually during test execution.
3. Observe and capture observations from (2) above in terms of performance and operability.
4. Capture transaction performance statistics via data test generator.
5. Capture transaction performance statistics via TAFI.
6. Monitor TAFI system interfaces to identify any bottleneck conditions (BellSouth system personnel).
7. Ensure that all generated trouble reports have been canceled/closed.
8. Reset test bed for next test (if required) or clean up production databases (BellSouth).
9. Execute test once with normal, projected transaction volumes and once with stress/load volumes.
10. Analyze performance reports.
11. Review execution and observation reports.
12. Document results and generate summary report.

7.6.3 Outputs

1. Test execution and observation reports
2. Certified software interface performance reports
3. TAFI performance reports
4. Summary report

7.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Global exit criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-4 |

8.0 Test TVV8: M&R ECTA Performance Evaluation

8.1 Description

The ECTA performance evaluation is a transaction driven test designed to evaluate the behavior of the ECTA interfaces under load conditions. This test will be conducted twice. The first execution will use transaction sets established to simulate projected July 2001 volumes for peak busy hour and peak busy day operations. The second execution will use a multiple of the volumes used in the first execution.

8.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to evaluate the behavior of the ECTA interface under load conditions, to determine system performance in terms of response time and operability, and to identify future performance bottlenecks.

8.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global entrance criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Certified software interface has been fully tested and is operational for the submission of test cases | CSI |
| Test transaction sets have been built and validated | Phase II Test Manager |
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| System test bed has been established | BST |
| ECTA test coordination details have been worked out | Phase II Test Manager |

8.4 Test Scope

ECTA interface performance will be evaluated under normal projected loads and in a stress/load test mode. The following chart contains the processes, sub-processes, and methods for evaluating the performance of BST's Residence and Business ECTA:

Table VI-7 Test Target: M&R ECTA Performance Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Performance | Projected Normal Loads | Timeliness Operability | Inspection Transaction Generation | Qualitative Quantitative |
| | Stress/Load | Timeliness Operability Capacity | Inspection Transaction Generation | Qualitative Quantitative |

8.5 Scenarios

A subset of the Appendix A scenarios will be used in this test.

8.6 Test Approach

Test transactions will be sent using the ECTA interface. The transaction sets are structured to provide a transaction mix consistent with current system usage, projected normal volumes, and stress/load volumes. Submission rates should mirror peak busy hour and peak busy day behaviors.

8.6.1 Inputs

1. Test cases and transaction sets
2. Personnel to operate certified software interface
3. Personnel to supervise and observe test execution
4. ECTA interface and associated test beds
5. Certified software interface

8.6.2 Activities

1. Feed transaction sets to ECTA interface
2. Periodically exercise ECTA interface functionality manually during test execution.
3. Observe and capture observations from (2) above in terms of performance and operability.
4. Capture transaction performance statistics via data test generator.
5. Capture transaction performance statistics via ECTA interface.
6. Monitor ECTA interface to identify any bottleneck conditions (BellSouth system personnel).

7. Ensure that all generated trouble reports have been canceled/closed.
8. Reset test bed for next test (if required) or clean up production databases (BellSouth).
9. Execute test once with normal, projected transaction volumes and once with stress/load volumes.
10. Analyze performance reports.
11. Review execution and observation reports.
12. Document results and generate summary report.

8.6.3 Outputs

1. Test execution and observation reports
2. Certified software interface performance reports
3. ECTA performance reports
4. Summary report

8.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-------------------|
| Global exit criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-4 |

9.0 Test TVV9: End-to-End Trouble Report Processing

9.1 Description

This test involves the execution of selected M&R test scenarios to evaluate BellSouth's performance in making repairs under the conditions of various wholesale maintenance scenarios.

9.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to evaluate BellSouth's performance in making repairs under the conditions of various wholesale maintenance scenarios.

9.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| Global entrance criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Test scenarios selected | Phase II Test Manager |
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| Test-bed circuits provisioned | BST |
| Faults inserted into test-bed circuits as required by the test scenarios | Phase II Test Manager |

9.4 Test Scope

Selected M&R test scenarios will be executed to evaluate BellSouth's performance in making repairs under the conditions of various wholesale maintenance scenarios. The following chart contains the processes, sub-processes, and methods for evaluating the End-to-End Trouble Report Processing test:

Table VI-8 Test Target: Execution of M&R Test Scenarios

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| End-to-End Trouble Report Processing – Resale | M&R Test Scenarios | Accuracy Timeliness | Inspection | Quantitative |
| End-to-End Trouble Report Processing – UNE/UNE Combinations | M&R Test Scenarios | Accuracy Timeliness | Inspection | Quantitative |

9.4 Scenarios

A subset of the Appendix A scenarios will be used in this test.

9.5 Test Approach

This test involves the execution of selected M&R test scenarios.

9.5.1 Inputs

1. Test-bed circuits with embedded faults
2. Personnel to create trouble tickets and track the trouble ticket status for each scenario.

9.5.2 Activities

1. Conduct circuit test if applicable for each test scenario.
2. Note test results.
3. Create and submit trouble ticket via TAFI.
4. Periodically monitor each trouble report throughout its life using trouble report status transactions in TAFI.

5. Note significant events in the trouble report life cycle (error occurrences, corrections, trouble ticket submission time, time cleared, etc.).
6. Calculate time to repair measurements for each test scenario fault repaired.
7. Document observations.

9.5.3 Outputs

1. A time to repair measurement for each fault repaired.
2. Summary report of observations.

9.6 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|-----------------------|
| Global exit criteria have been satisfied | See Table III-4 |
| Time to repair measurements for repaired faults | Phase II Test Manager |
| Summary report of observations | Phase II Test Manager |

10.0 Test TVV10: Billing Functional Usage Evaluation

10.1 Description

The Functional Usage Evaluation is an analysis of BST's daily message processing to ensure usage record types including Access records, Rated records, Unrated records and Credit records appear accurately on the Daily Usage Feed (DUF) according to the defined schedule.

10.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to evaluate the following:

- Accuracy and completeness of all usage record types on the DUF including access records that should appear, not receiving records that should not appear, and not receiving empty set files.
- Timeliness of the DUF and access records delivery

10.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| All Global Entrance Criteria satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| Test bed completed and ready | BST |
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| Techniques and instrumentation developed and approved | Phase II Test Manager |

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|--|-----------------------|
| BST resources are available to participate in the test | BST |
| Detailed Test Plan completed and approved | Phase II Test Manager |

10.4 Test Scope

Table VI-9 Scope of the Functional Usage Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub-Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Technique | Criteria Type |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Usage and Delivery | Track valid usage | Timeliness of DUF files and records | Inspections | Quantitative |
| | Account for no usage | Completeness of data | Inspections | Quantitative |

10.5 Scenarios

Test calling is dependent on the provisioning process, which is dependent on scenarios. Some customers are subject to service changes (e.g. migrations from BST retail to a CLEC, feature changes, etc.). Test calls and service changes will occur simultaneously.

A subset of the Appendix A scenarios will be used in this test.

10.6 Test Approach

This test will use operational analysis to evaluate the accuracy and completeness of records contained in the DUF. This analysis will also examine the age of calls on the DUF. The evaluations will be accomplished by dispatching testers to various locations within Florida. These testers will place test calls and will record information about these calls including the "call from" number, "call to" number, "bill to" number, call time and duration. The data contained in these Daily Usage Feeds will then be compared to the call logs. The Test Team will also record information about the contents of DUFs received by Phase II Test Manager.

Test calls will be made using some customer accounts that will migrate during the test period. Migration refers to the conversion of account ownership from one LEC to another. Test calls will be made from migrating accounts before and after the migration date to ensure accurate routing of data in the Daily Usage Feed.

For example, a BST retail customer migrates to a CLEC during the test. Call made by the customer prior to migration should be routed to BST. Calls made by the customer after migration should be routed to the new CLEC.

Test calls should be placed from around the BST calling region. Test calls will be made throughout the workday. Test calls will include a variety of call types with the exception of 911, and will be placed from locations where 5E, Siemens and DMS

switches are used. Local and toll test calls terminating on the test lines will also be made. These calls will be subject to evaluation.

10.6.1 Inputs

1. Detailed Test Plan
2. Test bed, including lines, telephones and facilities

10.6.2 Activities

1. Test Team will develop Test Call Matrices, which include test call logs for each location, on each day, for each originating phone number.
2. Test Team will assemble tester resources, provide instructions and dispatch testers to calling locations.
3. Testers will complete calls and log results.
4. Test Team will receive DUF files from BST.
5. Test Team will verify that appropriate data is on the DUF.
6. Test Team will verify that calls that do not belong on the DUF are not on the DUF.
7. Test Team will verify that appropriate calls present in the DUF match the testers call log.
8. Test Team will identify DUF files that contain no billable records.
9. Using records received in the DUF files, Test Team will validate the age of calls by determining the number of business days between the call date and the day the DUF file was created.
10. Test Team will compile results.

10.6.3 Outputs

1. Call Logs Report – A report of the testers logs.
2. DUF Accuracy and Completeness Report – A report showing the validation of calls made during the test.
3. Empty DUF Files Report – A Report showing the number of empty DUF files sent by BST.
4. Final report.

10.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| All Global Exit Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |

11.0 Test TVV11: Functional Carrier Bill Evaluation

11.1 Description

The Functional Carrier Bill Evaluation is an analysis of BST's ability to accurately bill usage plus monthly recurring charges (MRC) and non-recurring charges (NRC) on the appropriate type of bill. An accurately billed item will contain the correct price and correct supporting information, such as start/end dates, duration, standard amounts, and discount amounts. This test will also evaluate the timeliness of bill delivery to the CLECs.

BST will need to run a bill cycle from the initial test bed prior to any POP tests to use as a baseline set of bills.

Monthly charges will be examined for both Resale and UNE billing on CABS and CRIS bills. Table VI-9 reflects a number of key characteristics of Retail and UNE billing information that will be used in the design of test cases. Information includes the various charge components and their destination bill.

**Table VI-10 Key Characteristics Of Billing Information
for Resale and UNE Customers**

| | Billing Component | Rating | Usage | Billing |
|-----------|---|--------|-------|---------|
| Resale | Usage | CRIS | DUF | CRIS |
| Resale | MRC/NRC | CRIS | N/A | CRIS |
| UNE | UNE loops, usage, MRC/NRC, and Combinations | CRIS | DUF | CRIS |
| UNE-Other | IOF, collocation | CABS | DUF | CABS |
| UNE-Other | High Cap Loops (DS1/3) MRC/NRC | CABS | N/A | CABS |
| Other | Directory Listings | CRIS | N/A | CRIS |
| Retail | Non-unbundled Services MRC/NRC (Ancillary services) | CRIS | N/A | CRIS |

11.2 Objective

This test evaluates the timely delivery of the bill and the accurate and timely appearance of charges on the appropriate bill. Appearance of charges will depend on

the type of products ordered and/or class of service changes for resale and UNE. Details to be evaluated include:

- Appropriate prorating of charges for new and/or disconnected service.
- Charges are accurate (order matches billing).
- Totals are accurate.
- New/disconnected products appear (or do not appear) on the bill.
- Bill dates are correct and match appropriate date from provisioning process.
- Adjustments appear on the bill.
- Bills are delivered to CLECs and Resellers in a timely manner.
- UNE billed on a usage basis are billed correctly.

11.3 Entrance Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|---|----------------------------|
| All Global Entrance Criteria satisfied | See Table III-3 |
| All CRIS and CABS baseline bills produced from the initial test bed | BST |
| Test bed matches requirements. | BST |
| Techniques and instrumentation developed and approved | Phase II Test Manager |
| Product descriptions and business rules for all transactions to be tested are available. | BST |
| Test bed completed and ready | BST |
| Calls made during Functional Usage Evaluation processed through to the DUF and available for billing. | BST |
| Availability of BST resources to test and produce CRIS and CABS bills | BST |
| Method for viewing bills implemented | BST, Phase II Test Manager |

11.4 Test Scope

Table VI-11: Test Scope for Carrier Bill Evaluation

| Process Area | Sub Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Techniques | Criteria Type |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------|
| Maintain Bill Balance | Carry balance forward | Accuracy of bill balance | Inspection | Quantitative |
| Verify Billing Accounts | Verify Billing Accounts | Completeness and accuracy of extraction | Inspection | Quantitative |
| Bills and Delivery | Verify normal recurring charges | Completeness and accuracy of data | Inspection | Quantitative |
| | Verify one-time charges | Completeness and accuracy of data | Inspection | Quantitative |
| | Verify prorated recurring charges | Completeness and accuracy of data | Inspection | Quantitative |

| Process Area | Sub Process | Evaluation Measure | Evaluation Techniques | Criteria Type |
|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | Verify Usage Charges | Completeness and accuracy of data | Inspection | Quantitative |
| | Verify discounts | Completeness and accuracy of data | Inspection | Quantitative |
| | Verify adjustments (debits and credits) | Completeness and accuracy of data | Inspection | Quantitative |
| | Verify late charges | Completeness and accuracy of data | Inspection | Quantitative |
| | Receive bill copy | Timeliness of media delivery | Logging | Quantitative |

As part of this test, a variety of products and services will be ordered. This may result in many variations in billing presentation from the two primary billing systems (CRIS and CABS). Relevant bill types will be selected for review based upon the product mix and anticipated charges as defined in the expected test results.

11.5 Scenarios

A subset of the Appendix A scenarios will be utilized for billing and usage testing purposes. The set selected will include:

- Test cases for 'migration/conversion' of customers
- Test cases for disconnects, new service (add/delete)
- Test cases for changes to services (modify)

All migration situations should be adequately represented:

- BST to a CLEC
- CLEC to BST
- CLEC to CLEC

The scenarios utilized for billing and usage testing will apply to all service delivery methods (SDM) available in BST at the time of the test(s).

11.6 Approach

This test will use systems and operational analysis to evaluate the completeness and accuracy of charges that should appear on the bill based on usage information from the Functional Usage Evaluation and selected scenarios. Expected results will be defined for each test case.

Three bill periods will be processed for the same set of customers.

- The first bill period consists of the baseline bills where customers created for this test are billed for the first time directly from the initial test bed. These

bills are produced prior to the execution of any transaction scenarios that affect selected customers.

- The second and third bill periods consist of bills produced after selected scenarios have been executed. This second set of bills will include items such as prorates, disconnects, migrations, adjustments, etc. Some customers will be created during the test execution, and will only receive second period bills.

The following list shows inputs, activities and outputs of the process needed to validate the full range of test cases.

11.6.1 Inputs

1. Detailed Test Plan
2. Verified Baseline Bills and CSRs
3. Selected usage from the Billing Functional Usage Evaluation (TVV 8.0)
4. CSRs and completions from relevant POP orders

11.6.2 Activities

1. Process service order changes
2. Develop expected results for each test case
3. Begin first bill period by receiving baseline bills
4. Record invoice bill date and actual date received
5. Validate test results for each applicable test case
6. Identify discrepancies
7. Receive Bills for next bill period
8. Receive CSRs for all cycles
9. Record invoice bill date and actual date received
10. Validate test results for each applicable test case
11. Identify discrepancies.
12. Complete second bill period. Repeat 7-11 until third bill period is complete
13. Compile results

11.6.3 Outputs

1. A report showing each test case, expected results, and discrepancies
2. A report showing BST bill delivery dates compared to the

expected delivery dates based on the bill cycle date

3. Final report

11.7 Exit Criteria

| Criteria | Responsible Party |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| All Global Exit Criteria satisfied | See Table III-4 |

Appendix A: Test Scenarios

The scenarios listed in this appendix are based on a current understanding of the products and capabilities that are likely to be available at the time the test is executed. Depending on changes in availability, the scenarios may need to be modified before the test begins.

Resale

| Activity | Res. POTS | Bus. POTS | Res. ISDN | Bus. ISDN | Centrex | Private Line | PBX |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|-----|
| Migration from BST "as is" | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| CLEC to CLEC migration | X | X | | | | | |
| Feature changes to existing customer | X | X | | | X | | |
| Migration from BST "as specified" | X | X | X | X | | | |
| New customer | X | X | | | X | X | |
| Telephone number change | X | X | | | | | |
| Directory change | X | X | | | X | | |
| Add lines/trunks/ circuits | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Suspend/restore service | X | X | | | | | |
| Disconnect (full and partial) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Moves (inside and outside) | X | X | | | | | |
| Convert line to ISDN | | | X | X | | | |
| Migrate from CLEC to BST | X | X | | | | | |

Please note: The scenarios will include variations such as planned errors and supplements to cancel, change an order, or revise due dates.

UNE

(Extended loops will be included in appropriate scenarios, if available.)

| Activity | Res. Analog Loop | Bus. Analog Loop | Res. xDSL Capable Loop | Bus. xDSL Capable Loop | Bus. DS1 Loop | Inter- office Facility |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Migration from BST without number porting | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Migration from BST with INP | X | X | | | X | |
| Migration from BST with LNP | X | X | | | X | |
| Migration from CLEC to CLEC | X | X | | | | |
| Add new loops to existing customer | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Add new interoffice DS1/DS3 facilities | | | | | | X |
| Purchase loops for a new customer | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Disconnect (full and partial) | X | X | | | X | X |
| Moves (inside and outside) | X | X | | | X | |
| Standalone directory change | X | X | | | | |
| Standalone INP | X | X | | | | |
| Standalone LNP | X | X | | | | |
| Convert from UNE combinations to UNE loop | X | X | | | | |
| Convert from Resale to UNE loop | X | X | | | | |

Please note: The scenarios will include variations such as planned errors and supplements to cancel, change an order, or revise due dates.

*UNE Combinations Involving Switch Ports**(including UNE Platform, if available)*

| Activity | Res. POTS | Bus. POTS | Res. ISDN | Bus. ISDN |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Migration from BST "as is" | X | X | X | X |
| Migrate from CLEC to CLEC | X | X | | |
| Feature changes to existing customer | X | X | | |
| Migration from BST "as specified" | X | X | X | X |
| New customer | X | X | X | X |
| Telephone number change | X | X | | |
| Directory change | X | X | | |
| Add lines/trunks/ circuits | X | X | X | X |
| Suspend/restore service | X | X | | |
| Disconnect (full and partial) | X | X | X | X |
| Moves (inside and outside) | X | X | | |
| Convert line to ISDN | | | X | X |
| Migrate from CLEC to BST | X | X | | |
| Convert from Resale to UNE-Combinations | X | X | X | X |

Please note: The scenarios will include variations such as planned errors and supplements to cancel, change an order, or revise due dates.

Stand-alone Preorder

| Activity | Residence | Business |
|--|-----------|----------|
| Obtain CSRs | X | X |
| Validate customer address | X | X |
| Reserve telephone numbers | X | X |
| Loop qualification (including xDSL) | X | X |
| Inquire about product/service availability | X | X |
| Determine availability of desired due date | X | X |

Stand Alone Maintenance & Repair

| Activity | Res. POTS | Bus. POTS | Res. ISDN | Bus. ISDN | Centrex | Private Line | PBX |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|-----|
| Short on outside plant facility | X | X | | | | | X |
| Open on outside plant facility | X | X | | X | | | |
| Short on the line within the central office | X | X | | | X | X | |
| Open on the line within the central office | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Noise on line | X | X | | X | | | |
| Echo on line | X | X | | | | | |
| Customer w/INP not receiving incoming calls | X | X | | | | | |
| Customer w/ LNP not receiving incoming calls | X | X | | | | | |
| Customer receiving incoming calls intended for another customer's number. | X | | | | | | |
| Call waiting not working | X | X | | | | | |
| Repeat dialing not working | X | | | | | | |
| Customer cannot call 900 numbers | X | | | | | | |
| Calls do not roll-over for customer w/ multiline hunt group | | X | | | X | | |
| Call forwarding not working | | X | | | | | |
| Caller id not working | X | X | | | | | |
| Pick-up group order for large centrex customer not functioning properly | | | | | X | | |
| DS1 loop MUXed to DS3 IOF not functioning. | | | | | | | X |

Appendix B. Normal and Peak Volume Test Section

A. Purpose

This section provides the methodology the Phase II Test Manager will use to define volumes required to evaluate the systems, processes and other operational elements associated with BellSouth's support of the competitive market. The purpose of the volume tests is to evaluate the ability of BellSouth's systems interface to process representative future wholesale transaction volumes to support competitors' entry into the market. These tests are performed at both peak and normal volumes. In addition, stress or capacity tests will be performed to test overall system capacity on selected transactions. None of the volume tests are intended to assess BellSouth's ability to provision future transaction volumes.

B. Scope

Scope is defined within each appropriate domain section. Statistical analysis of volume data will be performed in accordance with the statistical principles developed during the collaborative process and described in Appendix C of this document.

C. Data Development

Overall normal daily test volumes will be developed through a synthesis of information obtained from BellSouth and various CLECs. The FPSC has solicited CLEC forecast data and will provide this data to the Phase II Test Manager for its analysis.

Orders by service will be developed using the BellSouth and CLEC forecasts of competitive lines viewed by service and order type. The Phase II Test Manager will develop a proportion for each service and order type based on forecasted net adds, and then will extend the normal daily volume figure by that proportion to determine the daily volume by service and order type. The daily order volume of supplements and order changes/disconnects and moves will be calculated by applying historic factors to daily volumes by service and order type.

The peak volumes are planned to be 150% of normal volumes. The stress volumes are planned to be 250% of normal volumes.

Appendix C: Statistical Approach

A. Overview

This test will rely on standard statistical methods to evaluate BST performance. Each test will define the data population to be observed, the measurements to be taken, and the statistical tests to be used. Data will be normalized, tabulated, and archived in a way that allows verification of test results and re-analysis of data using additional statistical methods, if appropriate.

B. Measures

The measures (metrics and their associated standards) that will serve as parameters for testing will be listed in Appendix D.

C. Sampling

In instances where sampling is used, sampling will be designed so that samples are sufficiently representative of populations with respect to the measures being studied to ensure that the resulting statistical inferences made about populations are valid. For most tests, simple random sampling will be used.

D. Hypothesis Testing

This test will employ a hypothesis testing approach to frame the analysis of test results. The standard "null" hypothesis will be that BellSouth is performing adequately. The possibility of an error arises if this hypothesis is rejected when it is true (Type I error) or is accepted when it is false (Type II error). An attempt will be made to balance Type I and Type II errors as much as is feasible.

E. Parity Tests and Non-Parity Tests

There are two basic types of tests. Parity tests compare a BellSouth retail average or percentage to a CLEC or test transaction average or percentage. The typical test for this type of comparison is a hypergeometric test for percentages and a two-sample t-test or z-test for averages. For those parity tests where sufficiently large samples can be drawn, hypothesis testing will be done by performing a "z-test" to calculate a "z-score." A z-score is a single number, which indicates the differences between sample data. A low z-score supports the hypothesis of parity (i.e., both CLEC and ILEC performance are from the same "population" in terms of performance). In cases where this test is not appropriate due to small sample size (for tests of averages) or assumption violations, other tests, such as permutation tests, will be performed.

Non-parity tests compare a percentage or average to a fixed standard or benchmark. In this case, the typical test is a binomial test or a one-sample t-test. Once again,

alternative statistical tests will be used, where appropriate, based on tests of assumptions and sample sizes.

F. Results

Test results will include a summary of the statistics calculated, the hypotheses postulated for the test, and the conclusion(s) drawn based on the statistical results.

Appendix D: Metrics - Quantitative

The Performance Metrics and Standards to be used for this test will be determined by the FPSC Staff based on input from the Performance Metrics Work Group consisting of representatives from CLECs active in Florida, Bell South, and the FPSC Staff. When these Metrics and Standards have been determined, they will be listed in this Appendix.

Appendix E: Reference Documents

This section describes the reference documents used in the preparation of this Test Plan. This section will evolve during the course of testing.

Document Reference

| Document Name | Sub-Category | Sub-Name |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Facility Based Activation Requirements | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1a, May 1999 |
| Facility Based Advisory Guide | Interconnection Svcs. | October 22, 1998 |
| LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 1 | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 7G, June/July 1999 |
| LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 2 | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 6a, June 1999 |
| LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 3 | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 3a, August 1998 |
| LEO Implementation Guide, Volume 4 | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 7e, June 1999 |
| BS Ordering Guide for CLECs | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 3a, March 1999 |
| LENS User Guide | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 7a, April 1999 |
| CLEC TAFI End-User Training Guide | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 6, January 1999 |
| LENS Release 3.0 Work Aid | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1, July 1998 |
| LENS Release 4.0 Work Aid | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1, November 1998 |
| LENS Release 4.1 Work Aid | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1, December 1998 |
| LENS Release 4.2 Work Aid | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1, March 1999 |
| Work Aid for Ordering Complex Services | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1, March 1998 |
| Electronic Interface Change Control Process | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1, April 14, 1998 |
| Products & Services Interval Guide | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 2, April 1999 |
| Local Number Portability Ordering Guide/CLECs | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1a, March/April '99 |
| Unbundled Local Loop Technical Specs | Interconnection Svcs. | TR73600 Issue B |
| Job Aid - Pending Order Status - Req'd Actions | Interconnection Svcs. | 11/19/98 |
| ENCORE System - Local Svc Request Error Msg | Interconnection Svcs. | 5/7/99 |
| BS Product Information | Interconnection Svcs. | |
| BS 1999 Carrier Notifications | Interconnection Svcs. | |
| Sample LSRs | | |

| Document Name | Sub-Category | Sub-Name |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Resale CLEC Activation Requirements | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 1, March 1999 |
| TAG Training for CLEC Programmers | TAG Training | Rls. 2.2, July 13, 1999 |
| TAG API Reference Guide for Release 2.2 | TAG Training | Issue 7, June 22, 1999 |
| TAG Programmer's Job Aid | TAG Training | - |
| Learning the Ropes of Local Exchange Service | Training | |
| PMAP Raw Data User Manual | PMAP | Preliminary Draft |
| PMAP User Guide Version 2.0 | Documentation | 8/15/99 |
| BS Service Quality Measurements Regional Performance Reports | Documentation | 8/10/99 |
| Test Plan Revisions & Cover email | Revisions | 7/6/99 |
| BS Service Quality Measurements | SQM | Version 063099 |
| BS Service Quality Measurements | SQM | Version 3/4/99 |
| Frequently Asked Questions | Documentation | |
| Accessing the SQM Reports | Documentation | |
| Legal Notices to Users of BellSouth Web Sites | Documentation | |
| BS Ordering Guide for CLECs; Cust Guide | Interconnection Svcs. | Issue 3a, March 1999 |
| CLEC Training - UNE Overview | Interconnection Svcs. | c. 1997 BS |
| Provisioning Scenarios | Provisioning | 7/18/99 |
| Forecast of Volumes | Forecast | 7/27/99 |
| Elec. Interfaces System Downtime - Release 5.4 | Letter | 7/16/1999; SN91081527 |
| Staged Test Testcase Specs for TAG CLEC Testing | TAG | 7/26/99 |
| TAG Application Architecture Design Document | TAG | V. 2.2.0.1, 7/29/99 |
| TAG Release 2.2.0.2 | TAG (Letter) | SN9108; |
| Unbundled Network Elements | UNE Information | (no date or version) |
| CLEC TAFI End-User Training and User Guide | TAFI | Issue 6 - September 1998 |
| EDI Testing Operational Rules for CLECs | From LEO Impl. Guide | Version 2/16/99 |
| Updated Version of SQM Documentation | Update | 8/10/99 |
| Telephone Number Reservation | Documentation | 8/17/99 |
| Florida PSC Staff's Proposal for Independent | | July 1999 |

| Document Name | Sub-Category | Sub-Name |
|--|--------------|----------|
| Third-Party Testing of BellSouth's OSS | | |

Appendix F: Glossary

| Term | Definition |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 271 Application | An application to offer long distance services from an RBOC to a state or federal regulatory agency. In order to grant this application, the agency must find the applicant is in compliance with the 14 point competitive checklist described in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. |
| AMA | Automatic Message Accounting. A system that records and documents billing information for (long distance) calls made by a (corporate) subscriber. |
| ASR | Access Service Request. Form used to order interoffice facilities such as dedicated trunk ports. |
| BellSouth Pre-Filing Statement | A filing with the State of Florida that lists commitments from BellSouth with regards to BST's 271 Application |
| Bill Certification | Process by which BellSouth demonstrates billing process management to its Reseller customers. |
| Bill Cycle | The grouping of customers for purposes of billing. An end-user normally belongs to one bill cycle. In Wholesale billing, all end-users belonging to the same bill cycle are aggregated onto a single CLEC bill. Assignments of cycle and period are accomplished by BellSouth. Bill cycles enable even distribution of a large number of customers so as to allow efficient use of computing resources and to mitigate risks associated with computer failures. |
| Bill Cycle Balancing | The procedure by which the charges associated with the inputs of a billing cycle are reconciled with the charges of the outputs of the billing cycle. |
| Bill Period | The length of time covered by a customer bill. Each end-user has one bill per bill period. CLECs receive one bill per bill period and bill cycle for all end-users belonging to that period and cycle. Assignments of cycle and period are accomplished by BellSouth. |
| Billing Domain | Tests related to creation of correct carrier bills. |
| Black Box | Internal processes within BellSouth's systems that are considered out of scope for the purposes of this test plan. Correct functioning of 'black box' systems can be inferred from input and output interface files. |
| BTN | Billing Telephone Number. The number to which charges from a given telephone service are billed. |
| BTN Accounts | Billing Telephone Number accounts. These accounts represent "dummy" phone numbers which are used to aggregate a Reseller's charges into a consolidated bill. Reseller's have several separate BTN accounts. |
| CABS | Carrier Access Billing System |
| CAP | Competitive Access Provider. Facilities-based carrier providing alternative access service. |
| Carrier Bill Code | Each bill format has its own unique code. Particular charges will cause the production of a specific bill format. The code is related to each product, and determines on which bill the product will appear. |
| Casual Usage | Usage dialed through a calling card or 10XXXXXX. |
| Central Office (CO) | Facility where subscribers' lines connect to switching equipment. |
| Change Management | The process by which changes are introduced at BellSouth. Important steps include: 1) Advance notification that a change will occur; 2) CLEC input is considered when making changes; and 3) Smooth roll-out of the change. |
| CLEC | Competitive Local Exchange Carrier |
| CLEC Live Data | Production data delivered through interfaces that are already operational for real CLEC customers. |

| Term | Definition |
|---|--|
| CRIS | Customer Record Information System. A database containing customer information used for billing. |
| CSR | Customer Service Record. Details of a customer's fixed monthly charges billed by the local telephone company. |
| Customer Account Record Exchange (CARE) | Industry standard for formatting exchange of subscription information. |
| Daily Usage Feed | A daily download of usage data from the switch which is delivered to BellSouth's message processing system and directly to the CLEC. |
| Data-Driven Process | Scenarios tested through the creation of generated transactions, operations data, or live data. |
| DID number block | Direct Inward Dialing. A block of numbers reserved for a Centrex/PBX. DID allows internal dialing by entering only extensions. |
| Document review | Compilation and review of books, manuals, and other publications related to the process and system under study. |
| EDI | Electronic Data Interchange. A process for exchanging information that is subject to industry standards. |
| EMI / EMR | Exchange Message Interface / Record. Standard format in which usage data is passed to the Reseller, as specified by Bellcore. |
| Entrance and Exit Criteria | The necessary conditions for starting or completing individual tests described in the Test Plan. |
| Evaluation Measures | Discrete set of measures to be applied to specific test components |
| Existence Criteria Type | These are criteria where only two possible test results can exist (e.g., true/false, presence/absence), such as whether a document exists or does not exist. |
| Expected Results Worksheet | A report format that lists the expected results for each test while allowing the tester to record the current results of the test. This allows an easy comparison of numbers. |
| FID | Field Identifier. A code used when administering usage limits on residence and business end users. Also refers to fields of information used in the service order. |
| Firm Order Confirmation | A response from the BellSouth Service Order Confirmation that acknowledges a successful receipt of an order from a CLEC. |
| Flow-through | An order placed by a CLEC's customer service representative that can be provisioned correctly without manual intervention by BST's service representatives. |
| Good Management Practice (GMP) Guidelines criteria source | This includes benchmarks, performance goals, and guidelines derived from industry and topic area experts, BST and CLEC performance targets, publications, academic journals and other sources. |
| GUI | Graphical User Interface. A computer interface that allows users to access programs and enter data. |
| ILEC | Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier. The local exchange carrier for a particular area as of 1996. BellSouth is the relevant ILEC. |
| Inspection | Physical reviews of process activities and products, including site visits, walk-throughs, read-throughs, and work center observations. |
| Interim Number Portability (INP) | The use of existing and available call routing, forwarding, and addressing capabilities to enable an end user to retain the same telephone number regardless of which local service provider is chosen. |
| LATA | Local Access and Transport Area. A geographic area established by law within which a Bell Operating Company may provide telecommunications services. |
| Legal and Regulatory Requirements criteria source | This includes requirements specified by statute and regulation, such as FCC orders, court orders, FPSC regulations, federal and state statutes, and other binding requirements resulting from judicial/governmental proceedings. |

| Term | Definition |
|---|--|
| Logging | Monitoring activities and collecting information by logging process events and products as they happen. Logging can be mechanized or manual. |
| LPIC | Predesignated Intra-LATA Carrier, or Local Primary Interexchange Carrier. Telephone company chosen by the end user as being the default carrier for calls outside the local calling area, but within the same LATA. These are also known as regional toll calls. |
| LSR | Local Service Request. Form sent to Local Exchange Carrier requesting local telephone services. |
| Maintenance and Repair Domain | Tests related to trouble administration. |
| Master Test Plan | Identifies the overall framework and structure of the test. |
| MCRIS | Message Customer Record Information System. System used within BST to receive and interpret central office switch usage records. |
| MDF | Main Distribution Frame. The primary point at which outside plant facilities terminate within a Wire Center for interconnection to other telecommunications facilities within the Wire Center. |
| OCN | Operating Company Number. A 4 character code to identify any service provider. Specifically used to identify the Reseller on usage detail records. |
| Operational Analysis | Operational analysis focuses on the form, structure, and content of the business process under study. This method is used to evaluate day-to-day operations and operational management practices. |
| OSS | Operation Support Systems. Systems used to perform pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing. |
| Parity Criteria Type | These are criteria that require two measurements to be developed and compared, such as whether external response time is at least as good as internal response time. |
| Performance and Capacity | Methods used to evaluate the performance and capacity of selected elements within the four domains. Relates to tests to determine if BST's OSS can handle quantities of orders matching a reasonable forecasted demand. |
| PIC | Primary Interexchange Carrier. The long distance company to which traffic is automatically routed when an end user dials 1+ in equal access areas. |
| Port | Point of access into a network. |
| Pre-Ordering, Ordering, and Provisioning Domain | Tests related to CLEC's acquisition of customer information, placing orders, and ensuring correct and timely provision and notification of order status. |
| Provisioning | The act of supplying telecommunications service or UNEs. |
| FPSC | Florida Public Service Commission. A state regulatory agency responsible for telecommunications companies. |
| Qualitative Criteria Type | These criteria set a threshold for performance where a range of quality values is possible, such as level of customer satisfaction. |
| Recognized Standards Criteria Source | This includes widely recognized standards and guidelines promulgated by sanctioned industry and governmental organizations and other bodies. |
| Relationship Management and Infrastructure Domain | Tests relating to activities, processes and documents that are focused on the establishment and maintenance of the CLEC/ILEC relationship. |
| Report Review | Reviews and analysis of historical data, reports, metrics, and other information in order to assess the effectiveness of a particular system or business function. This includes performance measurement reports and other management reports. |
| Scalability | The degree to which an application can be scaled to accommodate order of magnitude increases in transaction volumes and users |
| Supplements | A change to an order taken after the original order was submitted, but before the order has been executed. Order execution should include all supplements. |
| Suspend for Non-Payment | Collection Activity including suspension of outgoing calls (one-way), or both outgoing and incoming calls (two-way) |

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| Test Bed | A set of fictitious customers that are designed to assist with testing. The test bed consists of working lines and provisioned products, although the owning customer is fictitious. The test bed is used to test all BST system functions. |
| Test Call Matrix | A list of call types and the quantity of calls for each type that should be included in a particular test. |
| Test Domain | A specific testing area with defined targets, measures, scenarios, evaluation methods, and test processes. |
| Test Scenario Coverage Matrices / Traceability Matrices | A list of products or processes that are involved with each scenario. Describes how testing elements are traced from the compliance requirements through the test process. |
| Test Scenario Index | Master list of scenarios from which specific scenarios will be selected to be used in the testing. |
| Test Scenario to Metrics Analysis Index Cross Reference | For each scenario, a list of metrics that are examined during the test. |
| Test Scenarios | Scenarios describe realistic situations in which CLECs purchase wholesale services and network elements from BST for resale to the CLEC's end-user customer on a retail basis. |
| Test Target | A discrete set of measures to be applied to specific test components. |
| TN | Telephone number. |
| Transaction Driven - GUI Cases | The GUI test method is applied to test cases that use the GUI approach in real-world actions. |
| Transaction-Driven System Analysis | Transaction driven system analysis relies upon initiation of transactions, tracking of transaction progress, and analysis of transaction completion results to evaluate the automated system under test. |
| Transaction Generation | Transaction generation is the use of live, historical, and/or generated data and data processing capability to evaluate an automated and/or manual system under test. |
| Unbundled Access | Ability of other LECs to access and use BST network components to fill in gaps where these providers' networks do not have their own facilities. |
| Unbundled Loop | A transmission channel between an end user location and LEC central office that is not a part of, or connected to, other LEC services. |
| Unbundled Port | An interface on a local switching system that is not bundled with a loop or transport facility, and provides access to and from the switch and the functionality of the local switching system. |
| UNE | Unbundled Network Element |
| USOC | Universal Service Order Code. A 3-5 character alphanumeric code that represents a product or service. |
| Verification and Validation | Methods used in the evaluation of activities and processes not amenable to data-driven testing, but which require verification and validation. |
| WTN | Working Telephone Number |